NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. DXXXI.

FEBRUARY, 1901.

TO THE PERSON SITTING IN DARKNESS.

BY MARK TWAIN.

"Christmas will dawn in the United States over a people full of hope and aspiration and good cheer. Such a condition means contentment and happiness. The carping grumbler who may here and there go forth will find few to listen to him. The majority will wonder what is the matter with him and pass on."—*New York Tribune*, on Christmas Eve.

From *The Sun*, of New York:

"The purpose of this article is not to describe the terrible offences against humanity committed in the name of Politics in some of the most notorious East Side districts. *They could not be described, even verbally.* But it is the intention to let the great mass of more or less careless citizens of this beautiful metropolis of the New World get some conception of the havoc and ruin wrought to man, woman and child in the most densely populated and least known section of the city. Name, date and place can be supplied to those of little faith—or to any man who feels himself aggrieved. It is a plain statement of record and observation, written without license and without garnish.

"Imagine, if you can, a section of the city territory completely dominated by one man, without whose permission neither legitimate nor illegitimate business can be conducted; *where illegitimate business is encouraged and legitimate business discouraged;* where the respectable residents have to fasten their doors and windows summer nights and sit in their rooms with asphyxiating air and 100-degree temperature,

Copyright, 1901, by The North American Review Publishing Company. All rights reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rather than try to catch the faint whiff of breeze in their natural breathing places, the stoops of their homes; *where naked women dance by night in the streets, and unsexed men prowl like vultures through the darkness on 'business'* not only permitted but encouraged by the police; *where the education of infants begins with the knowledge of prostitution* and the training of little girls is training in the arts of Phryne; where *American* girls brought up with the refinements of *American* homes are imported from small towns up-State, Massachusetts, Connecticut and New Jersey, and kept as virtually prisoners as if they were locked up behind jail bars until they have lost all semblance of womanhood; *where small boys are taught to solicit for the women of disorderly houses;* where there is an organized society of young men *whose sole business in life is to corrupt young girls and turn them over to bawdy houses;* where men walking with their wives along the street are openly insulted; *where children that have adult diseases are the chief patrons of the hospitals and dispensaries;* where it is the rule, rather than the exception, that *murder, rape, robbery and theft go unpunished*—in short where the Premium of the most awful forms of Vice is the Profit of the politicians."

The following news from China appeared in *The Sun,* of New York, on Christmas Eve. The italics are mine:

"The Rev. Mr. Ament, of the American Board of Foreign Missions, has returned from a trip which he made for the purpose of collecting indemnities for damages done by Boxers. *Everywhere he went he compelled the Chinese to pay.* He says that all his native Christians are now provided for. He had 700 of them under his charge, and 300 were killed. He has *collected* 300 *taels for each* of these murders, and has *compelled full payment for all the property belonging to Christians* that was destroyed. He also assessed *fines* amounting to THIRTEEN TIMES the amount of the indemnity. *This money will be used for the propagation of the Gospel.*

"Mr. Ament declares that the compensation he has collected is *moderate,* when compared with the amount secured by the Catholics, who demand, in addition to money, *head for head.* They collect 500 taels for each murder of a Catholic. In the Wenchiu country, 680 Catholics were killed, and for this the European Catholics here demand 750,000 strings of cash and 680 *heads.*

"In the course of a conversation, Mr. Ament referred to the attitude of the missionaries toward the Chinese. He said:

" 'I deny emphatically that the missionaries are *vindictive,* that they *generally* looted, or that they have done anything *since* the siege that *the circumstances did not demand.* I criticise the Americans. *The soft hand of the Americans is not as good as the mailed fist of the Germans.* If you deal with the Chinese with a soft hand they will take advantage of it.'

"The statement that the French Government will return the loot taken by the French soldiers, is the source of the greatest amusement here. The French soldiers were more systematic looters than the Germans, and it is a fact that to-day *Catholic Christians,* carrying French flags and armed with modern guns, *are looting villages* in the Province of Chili."

By happy luck, we get all these glad tidings on Christmas

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Eve—just in time to enable us to celebrate the day with proper gaiety and enthusiasm. Our spirits soar, and we find we can even make jokes: Taels I win, Heads you lose.

Our Reverend Ament is the right man in the right place. What we want of our missionaries out there is, not that they shall merely represent in their acts and persons the grace and gentleness and charity and loving kindness of our religion, but that they shall also represent the American spirit. The oldest Americans are the Pawnees. Macallum's History says:

"When a white Boxer kills a Pawnee and destroys his property, the other Pawnees do not trouble to seek *him* out, they kill any white person that comes along; also, they make some white village pay deceased's heirs the full cash value of deceased, together with full cash value of the property destroyed; they also make the village pay, in addition, *thirteen times* the value of that property into a fund for the dissemination of the Pawnee religion, which they regard as the best of all religions for the softening and humanizing of the heart of man. It is their idea that it is only fair and right that the innocent should be made to suffer for the guilty, and that it is better that ninety and nine innocent should suffer than that one guilty person should escape."

Our Reverend Ament is justifiably jealous of those enterprising Catholics, who not only get big money for each lost convert, but get "head for head" besides. But he should soothe himself with the reflection that the entirety of their exactions are for their own pockets, whereas he, less selfishly, devotes only 300 taels per head to that service, and gives the whole vast thirteen repetitions of the property-indemnity to the service of propagating the Gospel. His magnanimity has won him the approval of his nation, and will get him a monument. Let him be content with these rewards. We all hold him dear for manfully defending his fellow missionaries from exaggerated charges which were beginning to distress us, but which his testimony has so considerably modified that we can now contemplate them without noticeable pain. For now we know that, even before the siege, the missionaries were not "generally" out looting, and that, "since the siege," they have acted quite handsomely, except when "circumstances" crowded them. I am arranging for the monument. Subscriptions for it can be sent to the American Board; designs for it can be sent to me. Designs must allegorically set forth the Thirteen Reduplications of the Indemnity, and the Object for which they were exacted; as Ornaments, the designs must exhibit 680 Heads, so disposed as to give a pleasing and pretty effect; for the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Catholics have done nicely, and are entitled to notice in the monument. Mottoes may be suggested, if any shall be discovered that will satisfactorily cover the ground.

Mr. Ament's financial feat of squeezing a thirteen-fold indemnity out of the pauper peasants to square other people's offenses, thus condemning them and their women and innocent little children to inevitable starvation and lingering death, in order that the blood-money so acquired might be *"used for the propagation of the Gospel,"* does not flutter my serenity; although the act and the words, taken together, concrete a blasphemy so hideous and so colossal that, without doubt, its mate is not findable in the history of this or of any other age. Yet, if a layman had done that thing and justified it with those words, I should have shuddered, I know. Or, if I had done the thing and said the words myself—however, the thought is unthinkable, irreverent as some imperfectly informed people think me. Sometimes an ordained minister sets out to be blasphemous. When this happens, the layman is out of the running; he stands no chance.

We have Mr. Ament's impassioned assurance that the missionaries are not "vindictive." Let us hope and pray that they will never become so, but will remain in the almost morbidly fair and just and gentle temper which is affording so much satisfaction to their brother and champion to-day.

The following is from the *New York Tribune* of Christmas Eve. It comes from that journal's Tokio correspondent. It has a strange and impudent sound, but the Japanese are but partially civilized as yet. When they become wholly civilized they will not talk so:

> "The missionary question, of course, occupies a foremost place in the discussion. It is now felt as essential that the Western Powers take cognizance of the sentiment here, that religious invasions of Oriental countries by powerful Western organizations are tantamount to filibustering expeditions, and should not only be discountenanced, but that stern measures should be adopted for their suppression. The feeling here is that the missionary organizations constitute a constant menace to peaceful international relations."

Shall we? That is, shall we go on conferring our Civilization upon the peoples that sit in darkness, or shall we give those poor things a rest? Shall we bang right ahead in our old-time, loud, pious way, and commit the new century to the game; or shall we sober up and sit down and think it over first? Would it not be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prudent to get our Civilization-tools together, and see how much stock is left on hand in the way of Glass Beads and Theology, and Maxim Guns and Hymn Books, and Trade-Gin and Torches of Progress and Enlightenment (patent adjustable ones, good to fire villages with, upon occasion), and balance the books, and arrive at the profit and loss, so that we may intelligently decide whether to continue the business or sell out the property and start a new Civilization Scheme on the proceeds?

Extending the Blessings of Civilization to our Brother who Sits in Darkness has been a good trade and has paid well, on the whole; and there is money in it yet, if carefully worked—but not enough, in my judgment, to make any considerable risk advisable. The People that Sit in Darkness are getting to be too scarce—too scarce and too shy. And such darkness as is now left is really of but an indifferent quality, and not dark enough for the game. The most of those People that Sit in Darkness have been furnished with more light than was good for them or profitable for us. We have been injudicious.

The Blessings-of-Civilization Trust, wisely and cautiously administered, is a Daisy. There is more money in it, more territory, more sovereignty, and other kinds of emolument, than there is in any other game that is played. But Christendom has been playing it badly of late years, and must certainly suffer by it, in my opinion. She has been so eager to get every stake that appeared on the green cloth, that the People who Sit in Darkness have noticed it—they have noticed it, and have begun to show alarm. They have become suspicious of the Blessings of Civilization. More—they have begun to examine them. This is not well. The Blessings of Civilization are all right, and a good commercial property; there could not be a better, in a dim light. In the right kind of a light, and at a proper distance, with the goods a little out of focus, they furnish this desirable exhibit to the Gentlemen who Sit in Darkness:

LOVE,
JUSTICE,
GENTLENESS,
CHRISTIANITY,
PROTECTION TO THE WEAK,
TEMPERANCE,
LAW AND ORDER,
LIBERTY,
EQUALITY,
HONORABLE DEALING,
MERCY,
EDUCATION,

—and so on.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There. Is it good? Sir, it is pie. It will bring into camp any idiot that sits in darkness anywhere. But not if we adulterate it. It is proper to be emphatic upon that point. This brand is strictly for Export—apparently. *Apparently.* Privately and confidentially, it is nothing of the kind. Privately and confidentially, it is merely an outside cover, gay and pretty and attractive, displaying the special patterns of our Civilization which we reserve for Home Consumption, while *inside* the bale is the Actual Thing that the Customer Sitting in Darkness buys with his blood and tears and land and liberty. That Actual Thing is, indeed, Civilization, but it is only for Export. Is there a difference between the two brands? In some of the details, yes.

We all know that the Business is being ruined. The reason is not far to seek. It is because our Mr. McKinley, and Mr. Chamberlain, and the Kaiser, and the Czar and the French have been exporting the Actual Thing *with the outside cover left off.* This is bad for the Game. It shows that these new players of it are not sufficiently acquainted with it.

It is a distress to look on and note the mismoves, they are so strange and so awkward. Mr. Chamberlain manufactures a war out of materials so inadequate and so fanciful that they make the boxes grieve and the gallery laugh, and he tries hard to persuade himself that it isn't purely a private raid for cash, but has a sort of dim, vague respectability about it somewhere, if he could only find the spot; and that, by and by, he can scour the flag clean again after he has finished dragging it through the mud, and make it shine and flash in the vault of heaven once more as it had shone and flashed there a thousand years in the world's respect until he laid his unfaithful hand upon it. It is bad play—bad. For it exposes the Actual Thing to Them that Sit in Darkness, and they say: "What! Christian against Christian? And only for money? Is *this* a case of magnanimity, forbearance, love, gentleness, mercy, protection of the weak—this strange and over-showy onslaught of an elephant upon a nest of field-mice, on the pretext that the mice had squeaked an insolence at him—conduct which 'no self-respecting government could allow to pass unavenged?' as Mr. Chamberlain said. Was that a good pretext in a small case, when it had not been a good pretext in a large one?—for only recently Russia had affronted the elephant three times and sur-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vived alive and unsmitten. Is this Civilization and Progress? Is it something better than we already possess? These harryings and burnings and desert-makings in the Transvaal—is this an improvement on our darkness? Is it, perhaps, possible that there are two kinds of Civilization—one for home consumption and one for the heathen market?"

Then They that Sit in Darkness are troubled, and shake their heads; and they read this extract from a letter of a British private, recounting his exploits in one of Methuen's victories, some days before the affair of Magersfontein, and they are troubled again:

"We tore up the hill and into the intrenchments, and the Boers saw we had them; so they dropped their guns and went down on their knees and put up their hands clasped, and begged for mercy. And we gave it them—*with the long spoon.*"

The long spoon is the bayonet. See *Lloyd's Weekly,* London, of those days. The same number—and the same column—contained some quite unconscious satire in the form of shocked and bitter upbraidings of the Boers for their brutalities and inhumanities!

Next, to our heavy damage, the Kaiser went to playing the game without first mastering it. He lost a couple of missionaries in a riot in Shantung, and in his account he made an overcharge for them. China had to pay a hundred thousand dollars apiece for them, in money; twelve miles of territory, containing several millions of inhabitants and worth twenty million dollars; and to build a monument, and also a Christian church; whereas the people of China could have been depended upon to remember the missionaries without the help of these expensive memorials. This was all bad play. Bad, because it would not, and could not, and will not now or ever, deceive the Person Sitting in Darkness. He knows that it was an overcharge. He knows that a missionary is like any other man: he is worth merely what you can supply his place for, and no more. He is useful, but so is a doctor, so is a sheriff, so is an editor; but a just Emperor does not charge war-prices for such. A diligent, intelligent, but obscure missionary, and a diligent, intelligent country editor are worth much, and we know it; but they are not worth the earth. We esteem such an editor, and we are sorry to see him go; but, when he goes, we should consider twelve miles of territory, and a church, and a fortune, over-compensation for his loss. I mean, if he was a Chi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nese editor, and we had to settle for him. It is no proper figure for an editor or a missionary; one can get shop-worn kings for less. It was bad play on the Kaiser's part. It got this property, true; but it *produced the Chinese revolt,* the indignant uprising of China's traduced patriots, the Boxers. The results have been expensive to Germany, and to the other Disseminators of Progress and the Blessings of Civilization.

The Kaiser's claim was paid, yet it was bad play, for it could not fail to have an evil effect upon Persons Sitting in Darkness in China. They would muse upon the event, and be likely to say: "Civilization is gracious and beautiful, for such is its reputation; but can we afford it? There are rich Chinamen, perhaps they could afford it; but this tax is not laid upon them, it is laid upon the peasants of Shantung; it is they that must pay this mighty sum, and their wages are but four cents a day. Is this a better civilization than ours, and holier and higher and nobler? Is not this rapacity? Is not this extortion? Would Germany charge America two hundred thousand dollars for two missionaries, and shake the mailed fist in her face, and send warships, and send soldiers, and say: 'Seize twelve miles of territory, worth twenty millions of dollars, as additional pay for the missionaries; and make those peasants build a monument to the missionaries, and a costly Christian church to remember them by?' And later would Germany say to her soldiers: 'March through America and slay, *giving no quarter;* make the German face there, as has been our Hun-face here, a terror for a thousand years; march through the Great Republic and slay, slay, slay, carving a road for our offended religion through its heart and bowels?' Would Germany do like this to America, to England, to France, to Russia? Or only to China the helpless—imitating the elephant's assault upon the field-mice? Had we better invest in this Civilization—this Civilization which called Napoleon a buccaneer for carrying off Venice's bronze horses, but which steals our ancient astronomical instruments from our walls, and goes looting like common bandits—that is, all the alien soldiers except America's; and (Americans again excepted) storms frightened villages and cables the result to glad journals at home every day: 'Chinese losses, 450 killed; ours, *one officer and two men wounded.* Shall proceed against neighboring village to-morrow, where a *massacre* is reported.' Can we afford Civilization?"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And, next, Russia must go and play the game injudiciously. She affronts England once or twice—with the Person Sitting in Darkness observing and noting; by moral assistance of France and Germany, she robs Japan of her hard-earned spoil, all swimming in Chinese blood—Port Arthur—with the Person again observing and noting; then she seizes Manchuria, raids its villages, and chokes its great river with the swollen corpses of countless massacred peasants—that astonished Person still observing and noting. And perhaps he is saying to himself: "It is yet *another* Civilized Power, with its banner of the Prince of Peace in one hand and its loot-basket and its butcher-knife in the other. Is there no salvation for us but to adopt Civilization and lift ourselves down to its level?"

And by and by comes America, and our Master of the Game plays it badly—plays it as Mr. Chamberlain was playing it in South Africa. It was a mistake to do that; also, it was one which was quite unlooked for in a Master who was playing it so well in Cuba. In Cuba, he was playing the usual and regular *American* game, and it was winning, for there is no way to beat it. The Master, contemplating Cuba, said: "Here is an oppressed and friendless little nation which is willing to fight to be free; we go partners, and put up the strength of seventy million sympathizers and the resources of the United States: play!" Nothing but Europe combined could call that hand: and Europe cannot combine on anything. There, in Cuba, he was following our great traditions in a way which made us very proud of him, and proud of the deep dissatisfaction which his play was provoking in Continental Europe. Moved by a high inspiration, he threw out those stirring words which proclaimed that forcible annexation would be "criminal aggression;" and in that utterance fired another "shot heard round the world." The memory of that fine saying will be outlived by the remembrance of no act of his but one—that he forgot it within the twelvemonth, and its honorable gospel along with it.

For, presently, came the Philippine temptation. It was strong; it was too strong, and he made that bad mistake: he played the European game, the Chamberlain game. It was a pity; it was a great pity, that error; that one grievous error, that irrevocable error. For it was the very place and time to play the American game again. And at no cost. Rich winnings to be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gathered in, too; rich and permanent; indestructible; a fortune transmissible forever to the children of the flag. Not land, not money, not dominion—no, something worth many times more than that dross: our share, the spectacle of a nation of long harassed and persecuted slaves set free through our influence; our posterity's share, the golden memory of that fair deed. The game was in our hands. If it had been played according to the American rules, Dewey would have sailed away from Manila as soon as he had destroyed the Spanish fleet—after putting up a sign on shore guaranteeing foreign property and life against damage by the Filipinos, and warning the Powers that interference with the emancipated patriots would be regarded as an act unfriendly to the United States. The Powers cannot combine, in even a bad cause, and the sign would not have been molested.

Dewey could have gone about his affairs elsewhere, and left the competent Filipino army to starve out the little Spanish garrison and send it home, and the Filipino citizens to set up the form of government they might prefer, and deal with the friars and their doubtful acquisitions according to Filipino ideas of fairness and justice—ideas which have since been tested and found to be of as high an order as any that prevail in Europe or America.

But we played the Chamberlain game, and lost the chance to add another Cuba and another honorable deed to our good record.

The more we examine the mistake, the more clearly we perceive that it is going to be bad for the Business. The Person Sitting in Darkness is almost sure to say: "There is something curious about this—curious and unaccountable. There must be two Americas: one that sets the captive free, and one that takes a once-captive's new freedom away from him, and picks a quarrel with him with nothing to found it on; then kills him to get his land."

The truth is, the Person Sitting in Darkness *is* saying things like that; and for the sake of the Business we must persuade him to look at the Philippine matter in another and healthier way. We must arrange his opinions for him. I believe it can be done; for Mr. Chamberlain has arranged England's opinion of the South African matter, and done it most cleverly and successfully. He presented the facts—some of the facts—and showed those confiding people what the facts meant. He did it statistically, which is a good way. He used the formula: "Twice 2 are 14, and 2

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from 9 leaves 35." Figures are effective; figures will convince the elect.

Now, my plan is a still bolder one than Mr. Chamberlain's, though apparently a copy of it. Let us be franker than Mr. Chamberlain; let us audaciously present the whole of the facts, shirking none, then explain them according to Mr. Chamberlain's formula. This daring truthfulness will astonish and dazzle the Person Sitting in Darkness, and he will take the Explanation down before his mental vision has had time to get back into focus. Let us say to him:

"Our case is simple. On the 1st of May, Dewey destroyed the Spanish fleet. This left the Archipelago in the hands of its proper and rightful owners, the Filipino nation. Their army numbered 30,000 men, and they were competent to whip out or starve out the little Spanish garrison; then the people could set up a government of their own devising. Our traditions required that Dewey should now set up his warning sign, and go away. But the Master of the Game happened to think of another plan—the European plan. He acted upon it. This was, to send out an army—ostensibly to help the native patriots put the finishing touch upon their long and plucky struggle for independence, but really to take their land away from them and keep it. That is, in the interest of Progress and Civilization. The plan developed, stage by stage, and quite satisfactorily. We entered into a military alliance with the trusting Filipinos, and they hemmed in Manila on the land side, and by their valuable help the place, with its garrison of 8,000 or 10,000 Spaniards, was captured—a thing which we could not have accomplished unaided at that time. We got their help by—by ingenuity. We knew they were fighting for their independence, and that they had been at it for two years. We knew they supposed that we also were fighting in their worthy cause—just as we had helped the Cubans fight for Cuban independence—and we allowed them to go on thinking so. *Until Manila was ours and we could get along without them.* Then we showed our hand. Of course, they were surprised—that was natural; surprised and disappointed; disappointed and grieved. To them it looked un-American; uncharacteristic; foreign to our established traditions. And this was natural, too; for we were only playing the American Game in public—in private it was the European. It was neatly done, very neatly, and it bewildered

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them. They could not understand it; for we had been so friendly —so affectionate, even—with those simple-minded patriots! We, our own selves, had brought back out of exile their leader, their hero, their hope, their Washington—Aguinaldo; brought him in a warship, in high honor, under the sacred shelter and hospitality of the flag; brought him back and restored him to his people, and got their moving and eloquent gratitude for it. Yes, we had been so friendly to them, and had heartened them up in so many ways! We had lent them guns and ammunition; advised with them; exchanged pleasant courtesies with them; placed our sick and wounded in their kindly care; entrusted our Spanish prisoners to their humane and honest hands; fought shoulder to shoulder with them against "the common enemy" (our own phrase); praised their courage, praised their gallantry, praised their mercifulness, praised their fine and honorable conduct; borrowed their trenches, borrowed strong positions which they had previously captured from the Spaniard; petted them, lied to them—officially proclaiming that our land and naval forces came to give them their freedom and displace the bad Spanish Government—fooled them, used them until we needed them no longer; then derided the sucked orange and threw it away. We kept the positions which we had beguiled them of; by and by, we moved a force forward and overlapped patriot ground—a clever thought, for we needed trouble, and this would produce it. A Filipino soldier, crossing the ground, where no one had a right to forbid him, was shot by our sentry. The badgered patriots resented this with arms, without waiting to know whether Aguinaldo, who was absent, would approve or not. Aguinaldo did not approve; but that availed nothing. What we wanted, in the interest of Progress and Civilization, was the Archipelago, unencumbered by patriots struggling for independence; and War was what we needed. We clinched our opportunity. It is Mr. Chamberlain's case over again—at least in its motive and intention; and we played the game as adroitly as he played it himself."

At this point in our frank statement of fact to the Person Sitting in Darkness, we should throw in a little trade-taffy about the Blessings of Civilization—for a change, and for the refreshment of his spirit—then go on with our tale:

"We and the patriots having captured Manila, Spain's ownership of the Archipelago and her sovereignty over it were at an end

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—obliterated—annihilated—not a rag or shred of either remaining behind. It was then that we conceived the divinely humorous idea of *buying* both of these spectres from Spain! [It is quite safe to confess this to the Person Sitting in Darkness, since neither he nor any other sane person will believe it.] In buying those ghosts for twenty millions, we also contracted to take care of the friars and their accumulations. I think we also agreed to propagate leprosy and smallpox, but as to this there is doubt. But it is not important; persons afflicted with the friars do not mind other diseases.

"With our Treaty ratified, Manila subdued, and our Ghosts secured, we had no further use for Aguinaldo and the owners of the Archipelago. We forced a war, and we have been hunting America's guest and ally through the woods and swamps ever since."

At this point in the tale, it will be well to boast a little of our war-work and our heroisms in the field, so as to make our performance look as fine as England's in South Africa; but I believe it will not be best to emphasize this too much. We must be cautious. Of course, we must read the war-telegrams to the Person, in order to keep up our frankness; but we can throw an air of humorousness over them, and that will modify their grim eloquence a little, and their rather indiscreet exhibitions of gory exultation. Before reading to him the following display heads of the dispatches of November 18, 1900, it will be well to practice on them in private first, so as to get the right tang of lightness and gaiety into them:

"ADMINISTRATION WEARY OF PROTRACTED HOSTILITIES!"

"REAL WAR AHEAD FOR FILIPINO REBELS!"*

"WILL SHOW NO MERCY!"

"KITCHENER'S PLAN ADOPTED!"

Kitchener knows how to handle disagreeable people who are fighting for their homes and their liberties, and we must let on that we are merely imitating Kitchener, and have no national interest in the matter, further than to get ourselves admired by the

*"Rebels!" Mumble that funny word—don't let the Person catch it distinctly.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Great Family of Nations, in which august company our Master of the Game has bought a place for us in the back row.

Of course, we must not venture to ignore our General MacArthur's reports—oh, why do they keep on printing those embarrassing things?—we must drop them trippingly from the tongue and take the chances:

"During the last ten months our losses have been 268 killed and 750 wounded; Filipino loss, *three thousand two hundred and twenty-seven killed,* and 694 wounded."

We must stand ready to grab the Person Sitting in Darkness, for he will swoon away at this confession, saying: "Good God, those 'niggers' spare their wounded, and the Americans massacre theirs!"

We must bring him to, and coax him and coddle him, and assure him that the ways of Providence are best, and that it would not become us to find fault with them; and then, to show him that we are only imitators, not originators, we must read the following passage from the letter of an American soldier-lad in the Philippines to his mother, published in *Public Opinion,* of Decorah, Iowa, describing the finish of a victorious battle:

"WE NEVER LEFT ONE ALIVE. IF ONE WAS WOUNDED, WE WOULD RUN OUR BAYONETS THROUGH HIM."

Having now laid all the historical facts before the Person Sitting in Darkness, we should bring him to again, and explain them to him. We should say to him:

"They look doubtful, but in reality they are not. There have been lies; yes, but they were told in a good cause. We have been treacherous; but that was only in order that real good might come out of apparent evil. True, we have crushed a deceived and confiding people; we have turned against the weak and the friendless who trusted us; we have stamped out a just and intelligent and well-ordered republic; we have stabbed an ally in the back and slapped the face of a guest; we have bought a Shadow from an enemy that hadn't it to sell; we have robbed a trusting friend of his land and his liberty; we have invited our clean young men to shoulder a discredited musket and do bandit's work under a flag which bandits have been accustomed to fear, not to follow; we have debauched America's honor and blackened her face before the world; but each detail was for the best. We know this. The Head of every State and Sovereignty in Christendom and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ninety per cent. of every legislative body in Christendom, including our Congress and our fifty State Legislatures, are members not only of the church, but also of the Blessings-of-Civilization Trust. This world-girdling accumulation of trained morals, high principles, and justice, cannot do an unright thing, an unfair thing, an ungenerous thing, an unclean thing. It knows what it is about. Give yourself no uneasiness; it is all right."

Now then, that will convince the Person. You will see. It will restore the Business. Also, it will elect the Master of the Game to the vacant place in the Trinity of our national gods; and there on their high thrones the Three will sit, age after age, in the people's sight, each bearing the Emblem of his service: Washington, the Sword of the Liberator; Lincoln, the Slave's Broken Chains; the Master, the Chains Repaired.

It will give the Business a splendid new start. You will see.

Everything is prosperous, now; everything is just as we should wish it. We have got the Archipelago, and we shall never give it up. Also, we have every reason to hope that we shall have an opportunity before very long to slip out of our Congressional contract with Cuba and give her something better in the place of it. It is a rich country, and many of us are already beginning to see that the contract was a sentimental mistake. But now—right now—is the best time to do some profitable rehabilitating work—work that will set us up and make us comfortable, and discourage gossip. We cannot conceal from ourselves that, privately, we are a little troubled about our uniform. It is one of our prides; it is acquainted with honor; it is familiar with great deeds and noble; we love it, we revere it; and so this errand it is on makes us uneasy. And our flag—another pride of ours, our chiefest! We have worshipped it so; and when we have seen it in far lands—glimpsing it unexpectedly in that strange sky, waving its welcome and benediction to us—we have caught our breath, and uncovered our heads, and couldn't speak, for a moment, for the thought of what it was to us and the great ideals it stood for. Indeed, we *must* do something about these things; we must not have the flag out there, and the uniform. They are not needed there; we can manage in some other way. England manages, as regards the uniform, and so can we. We have to send soldiers—we can't get out of that—but we can disguise them. It is the way England does in South Africa. Even Mr. Chamberlain himself takes pride

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in England's honorable uniform, and makes the army down there wear an ugly and odious and appropriate disguise, of yellow stuff such as quarantine flags are made of, and which are hoisted to warn the healthy away from unclean disease and repulsive death. This cloth is called khaki. We could adopt it. It is light, comfortable, grotesque, and deceives the enemy, for he cannot conceive of a soldier being concealed in it.

And as for a flag for the Philippine Province, it is easily managed. We can have a special one—our States do it: we can have just our usual flag, with the white stripes painted black and the stars replaced by the skull and cross-bones.

And we do not need that Civil Commission out there. Having no powers, it has to invent them, and that kind of work cannot be effectively done by just anybody; an expert is required. Mr. Croker can be spared. We do not want the United States represented there, but only the Game.

By help of these suggested amendments, Progress and Civilization in that country can have a boom, and it will take in the Persons who are Sitting in Darkness, and we can resume Business at the old stand.

MARK TWAIN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MUSINGS UPON CURRENT TOPICS.

BY BENJAMIN HARRISON, FORMERLY PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

It is a rare pleasure to make a good end of a long and strenuous effort; to put wholly out of the mind a subject that has filled every chamber of it for two years. Minds are lodging-houses. The lodgers are of all sorts—casuals and regulars, modest attic-dwellers who have no call bells, and first-floor boarders who rent a large space and fill a larger one. Now and then some pretentious and exacting fellow crowds out every other lodger and takes the house. There is not wanting a sense of the dignity the house borrows from this august guest; but emancipation abides his going. When the last truckload of his baggage has departed, and the door is barred against the spirits that have a penchant for garnished houses, what a glad sense of freedom the overworked mistress feels! Every room vacant, but nothing "to let." This will not do for a permanent state, but as a short experience it is ecstatic. I have known what it is to have an imperial tenant of the whole mind, and have experienced the joys of an ouster. The case of Venezuela, in the Anglo-Venezuelan arbitration, demanded the unremitting labor of two years. What a sense of freedom came, when every book and paper connected with the case was put out of sight! I was again in fellowship with the undergraduates dancing over the grave of the calculus. The trouble with the calculus is that you must work out the problems, you must bring the answers. If you could stop when one problem gets hard, and try another, as the squirrel does with his nuts, the undergraduate would regard the book differently. A *non sequitur* is a hateful thing. Answers must be right. But it is not, I hope, a sin against a sound mind to stop short of an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

answer; you do not need to climb to the top of every hill you see. To raise questions, to speculate, to balance such *pros* and *cons* as come easy, and to stop short of conclusions, is admissible —in vacation.

The notes that follow are largely exercises of that sort, made chiefly during the winter days when there were no tenants, and the sign "to let" was not in the window.

The electric, self-binding newspaper drops its sheaves at our feet with bewildering rapidity. The stackers must keep up; but a vagrant may take a sheaf for a pillow and lie down in the shade.

THE ANTI-WAR PARTY.

There is an anti-war party in Great Britain and another in the United States. A war seems to imply an anti-war party. Indeed, the Gospels carry such an implication in a general sense. Both here and in Great Britain the anti-war party has been brought under fire of bitter invective. We, for the most part, decline to discuss with the anti-war man the justice of the war. That issue has been voted upon and carried, we say, and every one is bound, not only as to his actions, but as to his speech.

But is the morality of the motto, "My country, right or wrong," susceptible of defense? Is it not to say: "It is right to do wrong?"—for the sentiment implies action. But may it not be quite the right, and even the necessary, thing to say nothing "just now." If my father is engaged in a wanton assault upon another man, and blows are being exchanged, I must in my heart condemn my father; but am I called upon to trip him, or to encourage his adversary by telling him his adversary is in the right? That would clearly be the duty of a bystander not of the blood of either combatant. But do I very much offend, or become *particeps,* if I withhold for the moment an expression of my disapprobation of my father's conduct? Or, on the other hand, can it be demanded as a filial duty that I cheer him on, and when his weapon fails give him another? Is it unfilial to say, "Father, you are in the wrong—stop"? I cannot get him into a closet that I may say this in his ear. His antagonist will hear it. And, if I speak in the necessary hearing of both, can my father retort, "If I am killed, you are my murderer; you have encouraged my adversary"? But, if the battle goes too hardly against him, must

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I not intervene and save his life? I can flagellate his spirit while I am binding his wounds. But if he is the victor, must I not bind the wounds of his adversary, and support his adversary's demand for compensation?

A country at war is very intolerant—the home guards more than the veterans, and the politicians most of all. When war is once flagrant, public sentiment—at least that part of it that finds expression—demands that every citizen shall be active in support of it. To speak against the war, to impugn its justice, is to encourage the enemy, is to be guilty of the death of such of your countrymen as afterward fall in action. The mob may not seek you, but you are a "suspect" to your neighbors. You will not be heard to offer such specious suggestions as that not you who opposed but those who brought on an unjust war are guilty of the blood of the brave fellows who are sent into action.

Indeed, you will not be heard at all, by this generation of your countrymen, unless disasters in war and money burdens open the way. Your magnanimity and sense of justice will be praised by the alien people in whose behalf your voice was raised. They may even build monuments in your honor, as we did to Pitt; but the home newspapers will, while you live, make you wish you had never been born; and, when you are dead, they will now and then exhume your skeleton to frighten those who live after you. You must give your soul to torments and expatriate your fame. A sea will roll between your monument and your bones. But a monument is a community rather than a personal necessity. The free spirit of a just man does not need a perch.

"The gentleman tells us America is obstinate, America is almost in open rebellion. Sir, I rejoice that America has resisted! Three millions of people so dead to all the feelings of liberty as voluntarily to be slaves, would have been fit instruments to make slaves of all the rest."

For more than a century, American school-boys declaimed these words of Pitt. Virginia voted him a statue and New York set one up at Wall and William streets.

"Congress passed," says Frothingham, "a warm and grateful vote of thanks to the noble advocates of civil and religious liberty, in and out of Parliament, who had generously defended the cause of America."

In his proposed address to the King, in 1777, Burke said

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

many like things, the nobility of which we have greatly applauded.

The utterances of these great Englishmen are very like in spirit to what Senator Hoar has recently said about the war in the Philippines. We do not agree that the cases are parallel. We are persuaded that the Filipino and the American are unlike, and that Aguinaldo and George Washington have no points of resemblance. We have the capacity of self-government; we deny that capacity to the Filipinos. Mr. Hoar has failed, apparently, to see that the principle that government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed cannot be invoked by a people incapable of self-government. In the interests of humanity, all people must be governed; and if they are incapable of governing themselves, does it not follow that some other nation must govern them? But it was not our purpose to bring into question Senator Hoar's conclusions, but to consider the measure of his guilt in giving expression to them as his honest convictions.

Pitt and Burke had not only great praise with us, but their repute in Great Britain is now the greater by reason of these utterances. The Mother Country has "come around."

Does it depend upon the outcome? If the war fails, do such utterances become noble and wise, and do they remain ignoble if the alleged aggressor is victorious? Is there no way to stop any war but to fight it out; or must the stopping of it always be left to the war party? In the popular judgment, generally yes; but in law and morals, how is it? The Constitution of the United States very clearly saves the liberty of the citizen to say that a war is wrong. The statue at William and Wall streets had not been forgotten.

It is not treason to say that a war is unjust. But if not noticeable by the law, such things may still be contrary to duty. Was there a duty upon Senator Hoar to keep silence? His motives were unimpeachably pure. All agree that he was not seeking the applause of his countrymen of this generation. All agree that he has the old New England conscience and the old American fervor for liberty and human rights. Possibly, he lacks the mercantile spirit. He may not give sufficient consideration to the metals and coal and forests of the Philippines.

But the question we are pondering is not were his views right, but did he offend against his country by giving expression

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to them? Now, it cannot be wrong to proclaim the truth when a matter is in debate. Are we not compelled, therefore, to prove his views to be wrong, before passing final sentence upon him? The popular condemnation sure to be meted out to the men who oppose when war is flagrant is a mighty, repressive force. But if some one, for conscience' sake, assails the war as cruel and unjustifiable, must we not justify it? Is it enough to say, "You are prolonging it; you are sacrificing the brave fellows whom we have sent to the front?" There is a semblance of unreason in charging the man who is trying to stop a fight with the bruises and wounds that ensue upon the failure of his efforts. To perfect the argument and fix his responsibility, must we not introduce this major premise: The war is just and cannot be stopped until the enemy has yielded.

Is there any other conclusion of the whole matter than this? A patriot may, if his conscience cannot otherwise be quieted, oppose a war upon which his country has entered; but if he does so, he puts his fame in the keeping of a distant generation of his countrymen, or possibly of an alien people. What some other people have said makes it proper to say here, that we must not forget that the soldier who fights the war does not declare it. He must not denounce it, nor must any patriot denounce him. The appeal, silent or spoken, that comes from him to his fellow-countrymen, not to make the war longer or harder, reaches the heart. He is our countryman; he carries and keeps the flag. We must be tender, and careful that we do not spoil his *esprit de corps* by ingratitude, or dash his courage by a failure to applaud it, or wound him by imputing designs against his country's liberties.

An armed rebellion against the state must usually justify itself by something more than a schedule of wrongs—a chance, at least, of righting the wrongs. And is it not possible that this principle sometimes applies to rebellious consciences, and requires them to take the balance of good and evil?

Of course, there must be a time for denouncing an unjust war; but does a troubled conscience have all seasons for its own, or only a time before the war begins and a time after it is over? The latter view is held by so many that it is not safe to assume that all who do not denounce a war approve it.

The almost unbroken record of disaster that has attended the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

anti-war parties should have the wholesome effect of discouraging a factious party opposition. We can get along with consciences; indeed, we cannot get along without them, if the reign of the Prince of Peace is ever to be brought in. The emphasis should be put upon the facts that justify the war, rather than upon epithets.

A "WORLD POWER."

The newspapers gave another turn to the vagrant questionings in which I was indulging myself, by their frequent references to the assumed fact that the United States has become a "World Power." We have been a Power, as that term is used by the law writers and in conventions, for more than a century. We have been a Power in a military sense on the land for many years, and by spells a Naval Power of renown. In a moral sense, we have long been familiar with the idea that we were the greatest of World Powers. We have believed that we had found and illustrated a scheme of free, popular government that would in time stir the sympathy and emulation of all nations and bring in everywhere republican governments.

Mr. Webster said: "We are placed at the head of the system of representative and popular governments." It is not in this familiar and sentimental sense, however, that we are now said to have become a World Power. Indeed, those who most affect the term seem to be quite shy of that sense.

What is it, how did it come about, and what advantages and responsibilities accompany the new status? Great Britain and the great Continental Powers, with more or less cordiality, have admitted the fact. Did it not indeed have an European announcement? Did our war with Spain make us a World Power, or reveal to us and to the world a pre-existing fact? As a revelation, it apparently came largely out of the naval fights at Manila and Santiago. It was not the charge at San Juan hill; for, in the way of land fighting, we had many times done greater things than that. Indeed, in the way of naval tactics and desperate courage, Paul Jones and Decatur and Perry and Farragut may be taken to have suggested long ago to observing naval critics that the United States had the capacity to be a Sea Power. Nothing has happened to make us forget these and other great naval captains. Their ships were chiefly wooden, and their guns

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

smooth-bore muzzle-loaders; but they came close, their holds were often flooded and their decks slippery with blood. Our ships went into a period of decay, but our navy personnel did not. We added some hasty scouting and cruising strength to our navy in the Spanish war, but only a little increased its fighting strength. It was not these additions to our naval strength that made us a World Power. The naval fights of the Spanish war did not originate a naval prestige, but revived it—caused other Powers to remember that, if we set about it, we could build unsurpassed warships and fight them unsurpassingly.

Relatively, we have been stronger as to war vessels than we are now—notably, at the close of the Civil War. But there was no talk then of being a World Power. We did not aspire to more than to be *the* American Power—a half World Power. So, after all, it could not have been our ships or our naval victories that made us a World Power. Something must be added, and it would seem that the addition must have relation to some new use of our military strength. The old use was wholly defensive, though the campaign might be what military men call "offensive-defensive." Paul Jones had entered the British channels. Our guns had been heard in the Mediterranean. The "Alabama" was sunk off Cherbourg. But all these visits were casual, and all had relation solely to American rights and liberty and the freedom of the seas. So, too, the Spanish war had its origin in an American question. We assumed a police duty in Cuba, because it is an American island—because the cry of "murder" was on our beat. Succor was an American not a world question. We did not assume a duty to police the world. We expressly disclaimed any hope of reward for our intervention. All this was quite out of the rôle of a World Power. Indeed, it seemed too sentimentally fantastic to obtain the credence of the World Powers. Some were incredulously sarcastic. Great Britain alone kindly made us think that she accepted our altruistic conceptions.

The World Powers have been those who allowed no geographical limitations—that is, none appertaining to terrestrial geography. The appropriation of the stars must, of course, await the air-ship. We only, among the strong nations, have lived under self-imposed limitations, of two sorts—one that had to do with geography and another that had to do with public morality. We have said: "We do not want, in any event, territorial possessions

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that have no direct relation to the body of our national domain, and we do not want any territory anywhere that is acquired by criminal aggression." And as to the doctrine of "spheres of influence"—the modern euphemistic rendering of territorial pocket-picking—we have denied its application to this hemisphere and denied to ourselves the use of it anywhere. "We will not—and the European governments had, on the whole, better not—interfere with the autonomy and independence of any American state," is our rendering.

We claimed no commercial advantages, save such as fair reciprocal trade treaties might give to us. In all European cabinet entanglements, we were quiescent. The apportionment of Africa, and the "rectification" of Asiatic boundaries by the division of lands that belonged to neither disputant excited American notice of an unofficial sort only. Our touch with the other great Powers was at two points only: first, in the pleasant exchanges of good will, and, second, in the watchful care that neither our commerce nor our people were unjustly discriminated against. The great value of our markets and our great food surplus strongly supported our demands for equal trade advantages, and our increasing military strength emphasized the value of a friendship unaffected by inherited animosities and free from entangling alliances. Our position was, of all the nations, the safest and most hopeful. Does the supposed new status imply a change of position or policy?

If the World Powers have any recognized creed, it is that it is their duty as "trustees for humanity" to take over the territories of all the weak and decaying nations, having regard among themselves to the doctrine of "equivalents." Have we become a World Power by an initiation into this *bund?* The only reason for the continued independent existence of a weak nation, in the judgment of the World Powers, is found in the difficulty sometimes experienced in applying or disregarding, in its case, this doctrine of "equivalents." A World Power seems, therefore, to be a Power having the purpose to take over so much of the world as it can by any means possess, and having with this appetite for dominion military strength enough to compel other nations having the same appetite to allow or divide the spoils. A veiled expression of the same definition is found in the terms "colonizing nations." There has been an attempt to associate the United

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

States with this programme of civilization, upon the theory that the "Anglo-Saxon" has a divine concession that covers the earth. This appeal to a divine decree is itself a concession to the Anglo-Saxon common-law rule, that the plaintiff in ejectment must show title.

The argument runs thus: "The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof." So much is of record. The next step is more difficult, for there is no prophet, no sealed transfer, no mention by name of the Anglo-Saxon. "The meek shall inherit the earth"—but the boldest advocate of expansion dare not suggest, as the minor premise, that John Bull and Uncle Sam are of that class. That Scripture seems to lead away from *them*. We must get away from all texts, I fear. Perhaps this is the best that can be done, certainly it is the best that has been done—Major premise: God's purpose is that men shall make a full and the best use of all His gifts. Minor premise: Dominion is one of His gifts, and the Anglo-Saxon makes a better use of dominion than the Latin, or the Boers, or the Chinese. Conclusion: The Anglo-Saxon, therefore, executes a divine purpose when he subdues these peoples and takes over their lands.

Is not this programme logically perfect and commercially profitable? The man who buries his talent must go into darkness. We are a little hampered in the proposed association with Great Britain in this programme of regeneration, by reason of the fact that our Declaration of Independence was writ too broad. The Briton has very carefully limited his charters of liberty to a declaration of his own rights, while we have unfortunately written into ours "all men." There is also a practical difficulty that must be thought of. We are late in getting into the business. The vacant lands—the lands occupied only by savages—have been taken up. The business seems now to promise responsibility and outlay rather than profits. The melon-patch has been spoliated, and the melon cut and divided. A new boy comes upon the company in the wooded hollow and is invited to take one of the ends of the melon. There is a very small show of red meat, and even that is very difficult of appropriation. If he is a wise boy, he will go his way—even though he has no scruples about robbing melon patches. The effusive cordiality of the invitation to make himself one of the party, will not make him forget the disproportion between the risks and the red meat.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If the United States now enters upon a scheme of colonization, it must plunge in—put away all scruples; there is no time to linger shivering on the brink. The frame of our government is excellent; there are some weak states that would be bettered by accepting our domination; and seeing that they are so ignorant as not to see the advantages of accepting it, is it not our duty to compel them? Can we innocently stand by and see nations distracted—property insecure, resources unused? Very many good people—some ministers of the Gospel of Peace—have been saying that they hoped Great Britain would succeed in taking over the Transvaal and the Orange Free State, because "Christian civilization" would be advanced by "British paramountcy" in South Africa. Old fashioned moralists were in the habit of scouting the maxim, "The end justifies the means." The imputation of this maxim to a noted religious order, as a rule of action, had much to do with the general odium in which that order was once held.

The peace of the world has been thought heretofore to depend upon the allowance of the doctrine that men and civilized nations have, as to other men and nations, the right to do something less than the best with their possessions, and to judge in large part for themselves what is best.

This view does not, of course, exclude the right, in the last resort, of other nations to intervene for the saving of a population from destruction by the barbarous use of the civil authority. There are exceptional cases when remonstrance, and even armed force, may be justified; but, in such cases, the delivering nation must follow the rôle taken to the end.

Individual and national independence implies the exclusive right to determine some things. Persuasion and remonstrance, even, have their limits, passing which they become impertinence. "It is none of your business," may lack some of the elements of polite discourse, but there are times when it ought to be said. The "up-stream" wolf, as Mr. Hoar calls him, in the old fable, has suffered great obloquy because he felt compelled to put his intervention upon the untenable ground that he was injured by the soiling of the waters. He lived, unfortunately, in a day when men and beasts felt compelled to show that what they meddled in was proper concern of theirs. It was a narrow view. He should have said: "True, the muddy water does not come to my lips, but your habit of drinking it is bad; you are not neat; and besides

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

you hold yourself aloof, and refuse to admit my children to the sheepfold."

What has hitherto saved the United States in great measure from the land lust and made her respect the independence and territorial autonomy of her weak neighbors? Was it that we did not until now feel the need of more territory; or was it a conservative timidity; or is there an American conscience that reprobates aggression and rejects the new doctrine, that the right of weak states to govern themselves rests not upon the consent of their own people, but upon the consent of the nearest World Power?

The Monroe doctrine has been understood to disclaim for ourselves what it denies to the Powers of Europe. The declaration of Mr. Monroe was, Mr. Jefferson said, "our protest against the atrocious violations of the rights of nations by the interference of any one in the internal affairs of another." It seems to have been always the way of this statesman to generalize. This accounts for the presence, in the Declaration of Independence, of philosophical maxims that now threaten embarrassment to our progress as a World Power. We must differentiate ourselves. We must proceed upon the theory that our standards are right, and our civil organization and social customs most promotive of the glory of God and the happiness of man. The "pursuit of happiness" may be an "unalienable" human right, but does it follow that another nation is free to be happy in its own way if we know a better way?

This propaganda of Anglo-Saxon supremacy does not seem to fall in with the programme of the Hague Peace Conference; and we can hardly hope to organize an international court that will allow the doctrine. On the whole, then, might it not be better to withdraw this programme of Anglo-Saxon paramountcy? The nation that goes out to slay and to possess in God's name must give some other attestation of its mission than the facts that it is the mightiest of the nations and has an adaptable language.

The men upon whom the tower in Siloam fell were not sinners above all men in Jerusalem; and the philosophy of the islanders among whom Paul fell—that serpents always bite the worst man in the company—was very quickly upset. Is it not possible that the philosophy of those who assign God's special approbation to the prosperous and the powerful may be quite as faulty?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

His intervention is more apparent when weak things confound the mighty. It is not safe to conclude that righteousness and the heaviest battalions are necessarily disassociated, but the tendency is that way.

Now, it happens that all of the Central and South American States are weak states. There is not a harbor so defended as to bar the entrance of a squadron of modern battle ships. No one of them has a navy that could offer the briefest resistance on the sea to any one of the great European Powers.

Practically, if each stood alone, its subjection by any one of the great Powers would be quite within the possibilities of a great military effort. If the cabinets of the four great Powers of Europe were to combine in a propaganda of colonization in this hemisphere, as they did in Africa—using the new doctrine of "equivalents"—the Spanish American states, south of Mexico, would, unless the United States gave its powerful aid, inevitably pass under European control. The Central and South American States have retained their autonomy only because the United States would neither herself infringe that autonomy nor allow other nations to do so. But for this, British Honduras might ere this have embraced the whole isthmus, British Guiana have included the Orinoco and Mexico have been subjected to the rule of a foreign king.

What hinders that the small states of Europe are not taken over by one of the great Powers? Is it any sense of the inherent right of these lands to a separate national existence or of their princes to their crowns? Such sentimental considerations would offer no more serious obstacles than the glistening spider webs in the grass offer to the feet of their marching legions.

These small states stand, out of deference to the European equilibrium. They cannot be shifted on the lever as units without destroying the balance, and Great Britain is not so situated as to make use of Continental territorial fractions. Her "walls of oak" would not be available for their defense.

What a grim commentary all this is upon our boasted Christian civilization, upon that plaything of the diplomatists and the tribunals, international law, and upon Peace Conferences! The sheep have their security, not in the shepherd or in the fold, but in the watchful jealousy of the wolves.

The fundamental principle of international law is the parity

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of nations. Arbitration is the special resource of the weak; but it was not available to the Dutch South African republics and was only available to Venezuela because of the intervention of the United States.

It is of the highest consequence to us, and to all of the Central and South American nations, that it should be known to them and to the world that the United States will continue faithfully and unswervingly to respect the autonomy of those states; that we will neither ourselves dismember them nor suffer them to be dismembered by any European Power. If the Spanish war, or this talk of ruling the tropics from the temperate zones, or of Anglo-Saxon alliance and paramountcy, has bred any distrust of our purposes toward them, it should be speedily dispelled. The supposed transformation, from an American Power to a World Power, in the sense I have described, is not to be imputed to us. Whatever may be in the minds of gaudy rhetoricians, we have not as a nation entered upon a programme of colonization, or of subjugation, or spoliation. We have not joined the wolves. We have still some of the care-taking instinct of the shepherd; still, at least, a latent capacity for sorrow when the word "free" is eliminated from the name of a state.

A merchant of my acquaintance said to a sentimental friend, who was troubled over the proposition that the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights sections of the Constitution had no relation to Porto Ricans, but applied only to those who dwelt upon the mainland: "The people care nothing about those things; it is money, commerce, that interests them." That is a low view of the popular thought.

We had in 1776 a generation of Americans that placed a higher value upon these sentimental things, and pledged to them their "lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor." The integrity of the Union was of more value to the men of 1861 than all lands and all lives.

If to be a World Power is to do as the World Powers do, then we must disclaim this new degree which the European College of Applied Force has conferred upon us. The taking over of the Philippines has been declared, by those who should know, to have been casual—of necessity—the acceptance of a divinely imposed duty. The question of the disposition of them, when their people shall have submitted to legal authority, is said to be still open.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

All of which is to say that the acquisition of these distant islands does not commit the nation to a scheme of colonization. The United States seems thus far in China to have stood firmly against dismemberment; not because of the practical difficulties of allotting the parts, but out of regard to the rights of the Chinese to preserve their national autonomy. But we are hearing now a great deal of the riches and the strategical advantages which have come to us with the docile acceptance of the Divine will in the Philippines, and a great deal of irresponsible nonsense about our being a World Power. If we allow ourselves to drift into bad ways, it is quite the same as if we had sought them.

The barbarous conduct of some of the allied forces in China, the shameless looting of private houses and public institutions, and the contemptuous and cruel disregard of all the sensibilities and rights of alien races which characterize the World Powers, shock our sensibilities. We have almost more pride in General Chaffee's blunt letter of protest against looting and cruelty than in his splendid fighting. Let us not be a World Power, in any save the good old sense—that of a nation capable of protecting in all seas the just rights of its citizens, and incapable everywhere of a wanton infringement of the autonomy of other nations.

BENJAMIN HARRISON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

JOHN MARSHALL, STATESMAN.

BY HENRY CABOT LODGE, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM MASSACHUSETTS.

On the fourth day of February, 1801, John Marshall went quietly to the Supreme Court of the United States and was sworn in as Chief Justice. It does not appear that there was any ceremony connected with this incident, or that any particular attention was paid to it. A few unemotional lines in the record of the Court are all that we have to bear witness to what was done.

On the fourth day of February, 1901, this event, which occurred so quietly a hundred years ago, will be commemorated in all parts of the United States. Judges and lawyers, professors of law and public men will address large meetings assembled to do honor to the memory of the great Chief Justice. In courts and universities, and before legal associations, men will gather to listen to words which will express to the American people our conception of the abilities and services of John Marshall.

This contrast between the formal and little noted incident of a hundred years ago and the elaborate ceremonies of to-day is in a high degree suggestive. Many events happened in February, 1801, but it appears now that the most considerable of them all, the one men deem best worth remembrance, was this almost unnoticed action of the Supreme Court on the fourth day of that month. Importance has come to it in the lapse of a hundred years, and it has attained to meaning on account of the man who was concerned. Here then, obviously, was a very great man, one able so to affect his own time and so to influence the future that his coming to the Chief Justiceship seems far more important now than it did when he died with his work done, sixty-five years ago. It is true that a great and powerful profession looks up to him as their greatest exemplar; but there is much more here

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than professional eminence or professional pride. Great lawyer and great judge are noble titles; but it is evident that Marshall rises beyond both, and that it is universally recognized that his career is too spacious for the annals of bench and bar, and is part of the history of the United States. It is quite clear that his fame and his work belong, not to the members of his own profession, but to the entire American people; and that, while he is held in peculiar veneration by lawyers and students of law, he has touched deeply the popular thought and imagination.

It is this side of Marshall which, it would seem, best deserves consideration at this time. To his professional achievements and abilities, justice is certain to be done by those whose training best fits them to do it; and appreciation of him as a lawyer and a judge by lawyers and judges is both sure and ample. To laymen, the most interesting inquiry is, in what way, through what qualities, and by what actual achievement, he has risen to be one of the greatest figures in our history as a people. Very clearly, he has occupied this large place by a broader title than can be derived from the determination of points of law, or the interpretation of a constitution. Other judges have attained to the greatest heights of professional eminence in that way; but Marshall has all the fame thus to be acquired, and a great deal more.

If we look for a moment carefully at just what he did, the secret of this larger fame and this more profound effect upon the history of his country will disclose itself. At the outset, it must be borne in mind that, when he came to the bench, government by means of a written constitution was a very new thing. France, within the preceding ten years, had made and unmade several constitutions, none of which really survived the perils of infancy. Her failures, red with blood, were not calculated to make the system of written constitutions seem either desirable or practicable. The Constitution of the United States, it is true, was planted in a most favorable soil; for the thirteen colonies had been founded, built up and governed under compacts, charters and written instruments, embodying the fundamental law in one way or another. On the other hand, the general tendency and experience of the English-speaking race had been against written constitutions. The only attempts in this direction in England had been made at the period of the Great Rebellion, and during the supremacy of Cromwell. They had failed then, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they disappeared when the Puritan domination ended, leaving a profound distrust for all such schemes and a very well-founded belief that they were alien to the spirit of the race. England reverted to her traditional system of an unwritten constitution, slowly built up and patched together—legally, by the courts, and, politically, by the House of Commons. This constitution may have been illogical, clumsy and imperfect, but it worked well, and it developed sufficiently to meet new exigencies as they arose.

The question in the United States was whether, among a people accustomed in a measure to written instruments of government, but imbued with English traditions, wedded to the common law, and profoundly suspicious of patent political devices, a national constitution, covering the complicated interests of many States, could be made to succeed. Here came one of Marshall's great achievements. So far as the court could do it, he made the Constitution march. He showed that it could take on the flexibility of an unwritten constitution, that it could be developed and made to meet new conditions, while it retained the fixity of principle and certainty of operation the lack of which is the ever present danger of a constitution which exists only in traditions, habits, two or three great charters and the decisions of courts.

The second question with which Marshall dealt was closely connected with the first, and even more vital to the United States. It was not only necessary to make the Constitution work, as a system of organic law; but it was essential to defend it against the principles of separatism, to make it dominant over the States and the means of creating a nation, of stimulating the national sentiment and nourishing the national life. Such a task was primarily that of a statesman; but the political branches of our government passed, in 1801, into the hands of the party which favored separatism and were destined to remain there for many years to come. Thus this great work of protecting and advancing the national principle was thrown back upon Marshall. Within the narrow limitations of the court, the single upholder of the national principle of the Constitution was obliged to do the work of a statesman. He succeeded completely, and that simple statement is, in itself, the highest praise and the most ample evidence of his intellectual power and his force of character.

When we realize what he did, stated in this broad and general way, it becomes of profound interest to know what manner of man

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he was, and how he accomplished so much. Unfortunately, outside the public records, the material for answering these questions is sadly lacking. Either Marshall kept no papers, or they were destroyed before or after his death. One or two meagre biographies, two or three brief memoirs by contemporaries, scattered allusions and fugitive descriptions, are really all that we have. Moreover, he not only left no papers apparently, but he wrote few letters himself. In all the voluminous collections of the correspondence of that period he is scarcely represented at all. He seems, in fact, to have had a curious indifference to his own fame, an indifference in harmony with the fine simplicity of his nature, and he was content to leave posterity to learn about him and his work from his public acts and speeches and from his judicial decisions. From these sources, we can indeed gain a perfect idea of his work and his influence, and of what he did toward the making of the United States; but all the details of his career escape us. This is a serious misfortune; for, apart from his long service as Chief Justice, his life was an interesting and varied one. He was born on the Virginian frontier, and lived there the vigorous out-of-door life of a new country, studying and reading with his father and with tutors. He was just turning to the study of the law when the Revolution came, and he went from his books to the camp, to fight in many battles, to endure many hard campaigns, and to serve through the war. From the army he went to the bar, and rose so rapidly to leadership among able men that no other proof is needed of his natural genius for the profession he had chosen. He served in the Assembly of Virginia, forced often against his will to accept an election. He carried a hostile district, and was elected to the Convention held to ratify the Constitution of the United States. Young as he was, he made there a profound impression, and in reasoning and argument he was not surpassed. He was one of the leaders in the hard-fought battle which resulted in a narrow victory for the Constitution. Unmoved by his success he returned to the bar and the Assembly, and he also refused offers of national positions; for he had come to be known throughout the country as the fearless and powerful champion of Federalism in the hostile atmosphere of Virginia. At last, came a duty which he could not decline. He was appointed on the mission with Pinckney and Gerry to go to France and endeavor to make peace with our former ally, now

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

changed to an overbearing and insolent enemy. The story of that mission is picturesque and interesting, disgraceful to France, and honorable to the American envoys who declined to bribe or barter. Marshall drew the statement of the American case, vindicated American honor, and returned. The results in the United States were the "X. Y. Z." letters, an outburst of patriotic wrath, and the election of a strongly Federalist Congress. For that Congress Marshall was urged to stand by Washington, and to it he was elected. There, as in the Convention, new though he was to the House, he went at once to the front and became a leader, as much respected for his abilities as he was liked for his even temper and kindly, genial ways. It was a short service, extending only to one session; for he was offered by President Adams the War Department, which he declined, and then the State Department, which he accepted. Here, too, he was a success, and it was while he held this great post that he was appointed Chief Justice.

His life up to that time contains more than has furnished forth many an elaborate and important biography. Yet the greatest part of what he was to do, his greatest work, lay all before him. Let us look at him a moment as he stands at the threshold of his great career. He is forty-five years old, and in the full maturity of his powers. He is very tall, very spare, rather loose-jointed and careless in his movements. A little ungainly, perhaps, one observer thinks, with the air of the mountains and the out-door life still about him. Evidently muscular and strong; temperate, too, with all the vigor of health and constitution which any work or responsibility might demand. He is not handsome of face, with his angular features and thick, unruly, black hair growing low on his forehead, over small, but bright, black eyes. None the less, the face is full of intelligence and force; and all observers, however they differ in details, alike agree that the bright eyes are full of fun, and that about the firm-set mouth there plays a smile, which tells of that generous and hearty sense of humor which pierces sham and, as Story says, is too honest for intrigue.

No one can say to-day whether Marshall realized, as he left the State Department, that the great work of his life lay all before him. We know it now; we know that all his past career had been only preparation for that which was to come. And what a training it had been! First of all, he was a lawyer—made so by the strong bent of his mind—in the full tide of successful practice,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and holding his well-won place in the front rank of the American bar. He had been a soldier of long and hard service, and had faced death in battle many times. A wide parliamentary experience had been his, drawn from many terms in the Virginia Legislature, the Constitutional Convention and a session of Congress. He had been in Europe, had seen European politics at close range, and had measured swords with the ablest, most unscrupulous and most corrupt statesman and diplomatist of the Old World. He had served in the Cabinet, and there had studied the relation of his country to the movements of world politics. He had been a man of affairs, great and small, and had lived and fought in the world of men. This varied education, these divers experiences, may seem superfluous for one who was to fill a purely judicial office; and yet they were never more valuable to any man than to him who was to be Chief Justice at that precise period.

When Marshall took his seat on the Supreme Bench, he brought with him, not only his legal genius and training and his wide and various experience in politics and diplomacy, but also certain fixed convictions. He was a man who formed opinions slowly, and who did not indulge himself in a large collection of cardinal principles. But the opinions which he formed and the principles which he adopted, after much hard and silent thought, were immovable; and by them he steered, for they were as constant as the stars. He had one of those rare minds which never confound the passing with the eternal, or mix the accidental and trivial with the things vital and necessary. Hence the compatibility between his absolute fixity of purpose in certain well ascertained directions, and his wise moderation and large tolerance as to all else. To these qualities was joined another even rarer, the power of knowing what the essential principle really was. In every controversy and in every argument, he went unerringly to the heart of the question, for he had that mental quality which Dr. Holmes once compared to the instinct of the tiger for the jugular vein. As he had plucked out the heart of a law-case or of a debate in Congress, so he seized on the question which overrode all others in the politics of the United States, and upon which all else turned.

That vital question was whether the United States should be a nation, or a confederacy of jarring and petty republics, destined to strife, disintegration and decay. In a well known letter to a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

friend, Marshall says that he entered the Revolution filled with "wild and enthusiastic notions." Most young men of that period, imbued with such ideas, remained under their control, and, in the course of events, became ardent sympathizers with the unbridled fanatics of the French Revolution, or, at least, ardent opponents of anything like a strong and well ordered central government, and equally zealous supporters of State Rights and separatist doctrines. Not so John Marshall. With characteristic modesty, he ascribes the fact that he did not continue under the dominion of his "wild and enthusiastic notions" to accident and to circumstances, when it really was due to his own clear and powerful intellect. In the struggle with England, he came to see that the only hope of victory lay in the devotion of the army to a common cause, in their being soldiers of the Union and not of separate colonies, and that the peril was in the weakness of the central government. It seems simple enough to say this now; but this central idea was, as a rule, grasped feebly and imperfectly, if at all, by the young men of that period. Like Hamilton, Marshall worked it out for himself; and, in the letter just referred to, he says that it was during the war that he came to regard America as his country and Congress as his government. From that time he was an American first, and a Virginian second; and from the convictions thus formed in camp and on the march he never swerved. Here was the principle of his public life; and to the establishment of that principle his whole career and all his great powers were devoted. These convictions made him a Federalist. It was this very devotion to a fundamental principle which was the source of that temperate wisdom which caused him to avoid the Alien and Sedition Acts, because, by their violence, they endangered the success of the party which had in charge something too precious to be risked by indulging even the just passion of the moment. But his moderation in what he regarded as non-essential, was accompanied by an absolutely unyielding attitude when the vital question was touched. Despite the criticisms of the extreme Federalists upon his liberality, there was no more rigid believer in the principles which had brought that party into existence than the man who became Chief Justice a century ago.

Holding these beliefs, what was there for him to do, what could he do, in a position wholly judicial, and with every other branch of the government in the hands of his political foes? He

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was confined to a strictly limited province. To his political opponents the entire field of political action was open. At the head of those opponents was Thomas Jefferson, who hated him intensely, with the peculiar hatred of the timid man, of acute, subtle, brilliant intellect and creeping methods, for the man of powerful mind, who was as simple and direct as he was absolutely fearless, and who marched straight to his object with his head up and his eyes on his foe. Marshall had crossed Jefferson in many ways. He had led opposition to him in Virginia, and had wrested from him a Congressional district. Now Marshall was placed in a great position, beyond reach of assault, and yet where he could observe and perhaps thwart Jefferson's most cherished schemes. Marshall, in his own way, entirely reciprocated Jefferson's feelings. He utterly distrusted Jefferson and despised his methods, his foreign prejudices and what seemed to Marshall his devious ways. So strong was his hostility, that it almost led him to make what would have been the one political mistake of his life, by supporting Burr for the Presidency when the election of 1800 was thrown into the House of Representatives. From this he was saved by his own wisdom and good sense, which were convinced by Hamilton's reasoning that Jefferson, whom Marshall knew, was a less evil than Burr, who was known only too well to Hamilton.

Jefferson and his party came into power with a great predominance, destined to grow more complete as the years went by. They were in principle hostile to the government they had been chosen to conduct. They were flushed with victory; they meant to sweep away all that the Federalists had done; they intended to interpret the Constitution until naught of it was left, and to put the national government and the national life into a strait-jacket. In the process of time, they found themselves helpless in the grip of circumstances, and governing by the system of Washington and Hamilton, whose methods and organization were too strong for them to overthrow. But at the start this was not apparent. The separatist principle was all-powerful, and Jefferson's followers threw themselves upon the work of the Federalists, and in their rage even undertook to break down the judiciary by the process of impeachment—a scheme which failed miserably, but which, no doubt, cherished the hope of reaching at last even to the chief of all the judges.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In their pleasant plans and anticipations of revenge, it must have seemed as if nothing could stop the onset of an all-powerful President, backed by a subservient Congress. Surely, the national principle, the national life, the broad construction of the Constitution, would shrivel away before such an attack. There seemed no one in the way; for, however much Jefferson, ever watchful, may have suspected, his own followers certainly did not reckon as very formidable the great lawyer sitting far apart in the cold seclusion of a court room. Yet, there this enemy was. There he sat intrenched. His powers were limited, but his opponents were to find out what he could do with them. They were to learn, by bitter experiences, that even these limited powers, in the hands of a great man, were sufficient to extend the Constitution and build it up faster and far more surely than they, by executive act or Congressional speeches, could narrow it or pull it down. Those of them who survived were destined to behold the Ark of the National Life, carried through the dark years of the first decade of the century, emerge in safety ere the second closed; and the national principle, which they had sought to smother, rise up in great assertion and with a more splendid vitality than any one had dreamed possible, as the fourth decade began and the man who had done the deed sank into his grave in all the majesty of his eighty years.

How did John Marshall do this work, this statesman's work, as Chief Justice of the United States? It is all there in his decisions. To show it forth as it deserves would require a volume. Only an outline is possible here.

The first blow was struck in 1803, in the famous case of "Marbury against Madison." Marbury applied for a *mandamus* to compel Mr. Madison to deliver to him his commission as Justice of the Peace, which had been signed and sealed by Mr. Adams and withheld by his successor. Marshall held that the applicant had a right to the commission; that, his right having been violated, the law of the country afforded a remedy; that the case in its nature was one for a *mandamus;* but that, a *mandamus* being an original process, the Supreme Court had no jurisdiction, because the act of Congress conferring such jurisdiction, not being authorized by the Constitution, was null and void. He declared, in other words, that the Constitution was supreme; that any law of Congress in conflict with it was null and void; that the Su-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

preme Court was to decide whether this conflict existed; and then, going beyond the point involved, he boldly announced that, if the application had been properly made, the Federal Court could compel the Executive to perform a certain act. At one stroke he lifted up the national Constitution to the height of authority, and made the tremendous assertion of power in the Court which, he declared, could nullify the action of Congress and control that of the Executive, if the necessary conditions should arise. Small wonder is it that Jefferson was irritated and alarmed to the last degree, and that he complained bitterly of the manner in which the Chief Justice had travelled out of the record, in order to tell the world that he might, if he so willed, curb the authority of the President! But the assertion of the supremacy of the Constitution, and of the power of the Court to decide a law of Congress unconstitutional, has remained unshaken from that day to this.

In "Marbury against Madison," Marshall asserted the supremacy of the Constitution and the power of the Court in relation to the other branches of the National Government. Important and far-reaching as this was, however, the vital struggle was not among the departments created by the same instrument. The conflict upon which the fate of the country turned was between the forces of union and the forces of separation, between the power of the nation and the rights of the States. It was here that Marshall did his greatest work, and it was this issue which he desired to meet above all others.

In the case of "The United States against Peters," in 1809, he decided that a State could not annul the judgment, or determine the jurisdiction, or destroy rights acquired under the judgments of the Courts of the United States. Thus he set the National Courts above the States; and he followed this up by deciding, in "Fletcher against Peck," that a grant of lands was a contract within the meaning of the Constitution, and that a State law annulling such a grant was in conflict with the Constitution of the United States, and, therefore, null and void. The United States Courts, it was to be henceforth understood, were not only above and beyond the reach of State Legislatures, but they could nullify the laws of such Legislatures. No heavier or better directed blow was ever struck against State Rights when those rights were used to thwart or cripple the national government.

The trial of Burr in 1807, although not bearing upon the cen-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tral principle to which Marshall devoted his best efforts, gave him an opportunity to define treason under the Constitution. On this memorable trial, there can be no doubt that he stood between the accused, whom the Government longed to destroy, and the just, popular sentiment which would fain have hurried Burr to the gallows. That Marshall's rulings were correct, and that he laid down the American law and definition of treason in a manner which subsequent generations have accepted, cannot be questioned. But this cannot be said of the famous ruling by which he granted the motion to issue a subpoena directed to the President of the United States. If his desire was to fill Jefferson with impotent anger and with a sense of affront and humiliation, he succeeded amply. In any other view the granting of the motion was a failure and a mistake; for, instead of showing the power of the Court, it disclosed its limitations. The Chief Executive of the Nation, clearly, cannot be brought to court against his will, for higher duties are imposed upon him; and still more decisive is the practical consideration that the Court is physically powerless to enforce its decrees against the Chief Magistrate, by whom alone, in the last resort, the decrees of the Court can be carried into execution. His animosity toward Jefferson was the probable cause of this single mistake in his long management of the judicial power. Yet it gives a vivid idea of the bold spirit which was able to make a limited court, not only the bulwark of the Constitution, but the chief engine in advancing national principles, when every other department was arrayed against it, and a hostile political party was everywhere predominant.

To assert the supremacy of the National Constitution over the constitutions and laws of the States was, however, only half the battle, and was in its nature a defensive procedure. It was necessary not only to maintain but to advance. It was not enough for the Constitution to stand firm; it must be made to march; and this was done by a series of great decisions, through which Marshall developed and extended the constitutional powers and authority, not merely of his own court, but of the Executive and of Congress. In 1805, in "The United States against Fisher," he found in the clause of the Constitution giving Congress the right to pass all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the powers vested in them by the Constitution, authority for a law making the United States a preferred creditor.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In 1819, the Dartmouth College case, the most famous perhaps of all Marshall's cases, was decided. In this, he gave the clause relating to the impairment of contracts, already used as the foundation of the judgment in the case of "Fletcher against Peck," a vigorous reinforcement and extension. In holding that a State could not alter a charter derived from the British Crown in colonial times, the Chief Justice carried the constitutional power in this respect to an extreme justifiable, no doubt, but from which a man less bold would have recoiled.

In the same year he pushed the same doctrine home in "Sturges against Crowninshield," holding that a State could not pass an insolvent law releasing debts contracted before its passage.

In the still greater case of "McCullough against Maryland," also heard at this time, he affirmed and extended the national power with one hand, while he struck down the authority of the State with the other. No man could add much to the argument in which Hamilton defended the constitutionality of a national bank; but Marshall presented it again in a manner which equalled that of the great Secretary, and which carried with it an authority which only the Court could give. He held the bank to be constitutional under the "necessary laws" clause; and, in one of those compact, nervous sentences so characteristic of the man, he defined once for all the scope of that provision. "Let this end be legitimate," he said; "let it be within the scope of the Constitution, and all means which are appropriate, which are plainly adapted to that end, which are not prohibited, but consist with the letter and spirit of the Constitution, are constitutional."

What an enlargement of national power is contained in these pregnant words! What a weapon did this single, weighty sentence place in the national armory!

The constitutionality of the bank being thus affirmed, the law of Maryland taxing its branches fell, of course, as null and void; for the power to tax is the power to destroy. That profound legal thinker, Andrew Jackson, differed from Marshall on this question. He wrecked the national bank, fostered the pet State banks, and left the panic of 1837 to desolate business and overwhelm his successor and his party in defeat. But, although Jackson tore down the superstructure, upon the foundation laid by Marshall—in an opinion where the foresight of the statesman went hand in hand with the matchless reasoning

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the lawyer—arose the national bank system, which after forty years still stands before us unshaken and secure.

Two years later, in "Cohens against Virginia," he held that the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court extended to decisions of the highest State courts, and that a State itself could be brought into court when the validity of a State law under the national Constitution was involved.

In 1824, in "Gibbons against Ogden," he interpreted and breathed life into the clause giving Congress power to regulate commerce, and he held unconstitutional a law of the State of New York which was in conflict with that clause. In so doing he overruled some of the ablest judges of the State of New York, and cut off a right hitherto supposed to be unquestioned. And another extension of the national power followed.

In "Craig and others against the State of Missouri," under the clause forbidding a State to emit bills of credit, he annulled a law of that State authorizing the issue of loan certificates, which were held to come within this prohibited description.

In the "Cherokee Nation against Georgia," he held that the Indians were not a foreign nation and, therefore, not entitled to sue in the Supreme Court; and then, with his wonted felicity of phrase, he described them as a "domestic and dependent" nation, dwelling within the boundaries of the United States, and subject only to the laws and treaties of the central government, a proposition capable of wide application, and carrying with it the possibilities of a great extension of the national authority. Following out this principle in the case of "Worcester against Georgia," he held that a citizen of the United States going into the Cherokee country could not be held amenable to the laws of Georgia. The Administration was out of sympathy with Marshall's views, the State of Georgia was openly defiant, yet, after some months of delay, the State gave way and the missionaries were released.

In this list of cases, so baldly stated, very many have been omitted and none has been explained and analyzed as it deserves. But these examples, chosen from among the greatest and most familiar, serve to show the course which Marshall pursued through thirty-five years of judicial life. These decisions are more than a monument of legal reasoning, more than a masterly exposition of the Constitution; they embody also the well-considered policy of a great statesman. They are the work of a man

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who saw that the future of the United States hinged on the one question, whether the national should prevail over the separatist principle; whether the Nation was to be predominant over the State; whether, indeed, there was to be a nation at all. Through all the issues which rose and fell during these thirty-five years, through all the excitement of the passing day, through Louisiana acquisitions and relations with France and England, through embargoes and war and Missouri compromises and all the bitter, absorbing passions which they aroused, the Chief Justice in his court went steadily forward, dealing with that one underlying question, beside which all others were insignificant. Slowly, but surely, he did his work. He made men understand that a tribunal existed before which States could be forced to plead, by which State laws could be annulled and which was created by the Constitution. He took the dry clauses of that Constitution and breathed into them the breath of life. Knowing well the instinct of human nature to magnify its own possessions, an instinct more potent than party feeling, he had pointed out and developed for Presidents and Congresses the powers given them by the Constitution, from which they derived their own existence. Whether these Presidents and Congresses were Federalist or Democratic, they would be certain, as they were human, to use sooner or later the powers thus disclosed to them.

That which Hamilton, in the bitterness of defeat, had called "a frail and worthless fabric," Marshall converted into a mighty instrument of government. The Constitution which began as an agreement between conflicting States, Marshall, continuing the work of Washington and Hamilton, transformed into a charter of national life. When his life closed, his work was done—a nation had been made. Before he died, he heard this great fact declared with unrivalled eloquence by Webster. It was reserved to another generation to put Marshall's work to the last and awful test of war, and to behold it come forth from that dark ordeal triumphant and supreme. John Marshall stands in history as one of that small group of men who have founded states. He was a nation-maker, a state-builder. His monument is in the history of the United States, and his name is written upon the Constitution of his country.

H. C. Lodge.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHAT ENGLAND OUGHT TO DO.

BY A CONTINENTAL OBSERVER.

THE writer of these pages has long been a sincere and devoted friend of England. He was not born on English soil. England did not give him life. She did not watch over his first steps nor protect his early years. But, no sooner had he found a voice capable of getting itself heard, than he vowed the most convinced and the sincerest admiration for the great and strong qualities which he detected, and which he still recognizes, in the British nation. He defended her interests. In the modest sphere assigned him he lent her his support whenever his conscience allowed him to do so.

But he would not and could not shut his eyes to the traits and things which seemed to merit legitimate criticism and just observation, even though these observations assumed in his mind an appearance of severity. He held that the moral grandeur of a nation is seen in the attentive simplicity with which it receives the just and sincere warnings given it by its real friends; and he was so situated, moreover, that he was able to judge both the strong and the weak sides of the English nation, and free, after having praised them with enthusiasm, to criticise them frankly and without fear.

The author of these pages has seen and heard and observed many things, and he has come now to the conviction that the moment is a grave one for England, that she has reached a parting of the ways where her choice of the route will be fraught with serious and prolonged consequences; for it depends upon her decision whether she will continue to loom more and more mightily on the horizon of history, or disappear in the fogs of the past.

The question "What England Ought to Do," was put to me some time ago, at the close of a conversation I had with a friend

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who holds a conspicuous position in England, and who is held in much esteem abroad, and who, moreover, is very well acquainted with men and things of our epoch.

"In my opinion," I replied, "England ought above all to do two things: Create a regular and well disciplined army, and secure a well-armed diplomacy."

It was then and thus, after having formulated my opinion, that the idea came to me to develop and explain my thought, and to say to a larger audience, in addition to the answer that I had given to my friend's question, what, in my profound conviction, was still a third duty for England. This will form the latter portion of these pages.

I.

Ever since the Transvaal war, whenever a Unionist or Conservative speaker, or even a member of the Opposition, has addressed either House, he has indulged in enthusiastic and, I hasten to add, well-deserved, praise of the English army; and, throughout the world, impartial minds readily join with him in this eulogy. Whenever an Englishman has treated of this campaign in a public speech, he has dwelt with reason on the immensity of the effort which England has accomplished in transporting, almost with mathematical accuracy, an army of 250,000 men to a distance more remote than any which an army so important has hitherto ever had to traverse. Neither the Roman cohorts, nor the Greek legions, nor the armies of Napoleon, ever accomplished with such ease a task so gigantic. Moreover, even if this army had been less heroic, it is the simple duty of every Englishman to render to it the fullest homage, to proclaim its valor and its endurance and devotion. The abnegation and sacrifice demanded by war from all who take part in it on a battlefield, are such that, if the soldier could not count on the gratitude of his fellow-citizens, on possessing, in a word, a parcel of that glory due to every army in action, and to every member of such an army, the work of war, in an analytic and sceptical century like our own, would be utterly impossible.

I cannot but approve, therefore, all these Englishmen who have exalted the courage of the English army during the South African war.

This colossal South African improvisation could neither have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been undertaken nor successfully carried through by any other power in the world; and the Spanish Armada was but child's play in comparison with this formidable exodus from Portsmouth to Durban and the Cape. And it is just because this immense effort was an improvisation, just because the goal of the expedition was a land whose resources, temper, contour and defiles were unknown, that everything in the execution of this enterprise, save the ignorance that presided at its inception, should be praised and admired. But England would be irremediably destined to decline, if this South African war did not contain for her one of those supreme lessons which Providence gives to a land, and which is not renewed if the country does not know how to comprehend its decisive significance.

At the outset of the war, once on South African soil, the frightful inadequacy of the preparations made itself felt in all directions. The Commissariat, the Medical Corps, the Strategic Section, the Corps of Engineers, the organization of the battalions and of the high command—all betrayed lamentable defects and revealed a state of things big with menace. If the English army escaped the complete destruction toward which it was being led, it was due, first, to the heroism of the soldiers, to their untiring patience, their docility, their passive obedience and uncomplaining stoicism; but it was due also, and above all—and this should be well understood and proclaimed—to the complete absence of military instruction in the enemy. The Boers had in their favor the ingrained arrogance of their temperament, an armament rendered redoubtable by their personal decision, but the handling of which was so much beyond them that they were unable to make out of it all that might have been made. At Colenso, where the two armies were face to face, the English general, disdaining or ignorant of all the new laws imposed upon armies by modern weapons, ordered the most astonishing and inconceivable of manœuvres. He had his artillery, so to speak, covered by his infantry and cavalry, thus making it an obstacle to, rather than a protection for, the dash of his troops; and he surrendered this heroic army blindly to the invisible balls of the Boers. Who can say what the disaster would have been for the English army, after the dreadful day of Colenso, if the Boers had not been ignorant of the first elements of scientific warfare; if, with their cavalry, their arms, and backed by their artillery and perhaps by the guns captured

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from the enemy, they had undertaken an organized, scientific pursuit, and effected, as they certainly might have done, the rout, and perhaps the utter destruction of Sir Redvers Buller's army?

Everywhere, in the first period of the war, at Spion Kop as elsewhere, the same thing happened. The Boers, rapid, invisible, inaccessible, decimated the English lines, and then, satisfied with the victory won, made no effort to follow it up and to reap its fruits by pursuit and destruction of the English army. The Boers, quite without military instruction, but of a resourceful and dashing courage, had no inkling of the art of manœuvring in mass, of fighting on a wide field of battle, and of avoiding, save by retiring or by flight, the enveloping movements of the foe, whenever the enemy was strong enough to undertake a flank movement or to take the Boers within two fires. In the open field they were absolutely inferior, and the sieges of Mafeking, Kimberley and Ladysmith showed this clearly enough, for their assaults upon these towns were primitive and childish from the point of view of the art of war. Even when Lord Roberts inaugurated the second phase of the war by the capture of Cronjé, it was the ignorant obstinacy of the Boer general, rejecting the advice of Villebois-Mareuil to save himself by a policy of retirement by sections, that facilitated the fine strategic scheme of the English marshal. In a word, to sum up my whole thought, I should say that the English fought, at least at the outset, as if they were fighting before 1870, and that the Boers, better armed, and with a greater passion for personal independence, fought as the Zulus or the Basutos might have done. It would really be to despair of human intelligence if England now, at the issue of this war, and face to face with her destinies, were not to draw from recent events profound and lasting instruction, and did not, as speedily and energetically as possible, undertake the reforms forced upon her by this war, which is henceforth merely a vain struggle of a conquered race against a victorious race.

Some time ago, an Englishman in high position, who is certainly well acquainted with the temper of his compatriots and the ideas of his government, said to me: "We are not going to insist on obligatory and general military service, but we are going to build up the army which we require by volunteer service, and we are rich enough to pay our volunteers." I would not exaggerate the effect which these words made upon me, but utterances like

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these from such lips filled me, I confess, with profound apprehension. Anything short of general and compulsory military service will be but a palliative, and England's enemies—that is to say, alas! owing to numerous and complex causes, almost the whole of Europe—will tremble with joy when they learn as irrevocable England's decision to confine her efforts for the improvement of her present military system to a device so little radical as that forestalled by my friend.

Every one is aware, and I am as well aware of it as any one, that the idea of compulsory military service is repugnant to the English nation. It has been hitherto calm and proud in the thought that it has escaped this terrible burden, peculiar in one form or another to each of the Continental states, the obligation for each male member of the nation to serve under the flag, with the vast weight of standing armies in time of peace, and with all the consequences, economic and social, of this régime.

Yes, the idea of compulsory military service frightens the English mind, and the vast swarm of Englishmen engaged in the duties and tasks of normal life have listened indifferently to the click of firearms and to the voice of the cannons from over seas. So inveterate, indeed, in England is the repugnance for the materializing life of the barrack-room that the whole system of English education has all along constituted an intentional and premeditated contrast to the positive and military training mingled with all education throughout the Continent. The volunteer camps of England, in comparison with real military instruction, are what a boat-race is to a match between ocean liners, or a horse-race to a cavalry charge: it is a hygienic exercise intended to strengthen young British lungs. The Englishman's university training has hitherto been, and still is, part and parcel of his ideas on military matters. I one day asked a very brilliant Oxford man, who had been talking learnedly and instructively of Thucydides, Sophocles and Euripides, what he thought of the battle of Dorking. "The battle of Dorking," he replied; "I never heard of that." No, the university training, as well as the military training, with the tendency of the young Englishman's mind, must be transformed and made to comply with the exigencies of modern times, as seen in the other nations. To be sure, if the principles of a "Greater Britain" had not penetrated English minds; if England's sole aims were the defense of her possessions

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

acquired previous to the present epoch; if the attitude she means to maintain were merely one of inflexible defense, an army recruited as in the past would suffice; it would be largely sufficient to protect and to maintain her territories previously won, and there would be no need, as to-day there is, and as everything proves there is, of abandoning her meditative calm, of assuming the heavy and almost painful burden of a standing army recruited after the fashion that has inevitably been adopted by all the great Powers, with the exception of England and the United States. But the United States is a republic, and large standing armies are a menace for the independence of republics, since, when the ambition of their generals is aroused, the civil authority has not at its disposal power sufficient to counterbalance the aggressive aims of the military chiefs. Thus the United States, unless imperialism renders it excessively imprudent, will avoid organizing a large standing army based on compulsory military service. Long ago, republican France was warned as to the danger lurking in its standing army, and the spectacle of recent years is there to prove that the warning was not misplaced, for a republic has not that personified authority at the top who awes the pride of the generals and commands obedience even from the most powerful.

But England is a monarchy, strong in the loyalty of its sons, and so strong in this loyalty that no military usurpation menacing the most popular throne this century has known is possible on its soil. So that, just in proportion as standing armies, based on compulsory service, and forming an immense homogeneous and domineering mass, are a danger for republics, so do they become for monarchies a mainstay and a defense. When it is a case of a country like England, having within her own borders an agitated and discontented province, possessing beyond the seas India and the Nile Valley and Burmah, exercising suzerainty over Canada and Australia, and called upon, while defending herself, to defend Malta, Ceylon, Singapore, Mauritius, Hongkong, Trinidad, Jamaica, the Barbadoes, the Bermudas, and many another West Indian isle, as well; when she has interests in Africa, in Asia, and, in a word, everywhere in the uttermost parts of the globe; it would be irony of ironies, it would be the rashest folly, to pretend to be ready to rise to these unparalleled and multiple responsibilities of imperial defense, by the sole organization of a volunteer army, on whatever principle such an army could be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

formed. At any moment, in any quarter of the globe, England may be attacked, imperilled, without her having either the right or the power to put herself in a state of defense, and withal being forced to cover, by her armed intervention, any point whatever of the limitless empire where floats her flag. This we saw clearly enough in the Transvaal. The Boers, to be sure, both madly and hypocritically, launched against England the challenge of their ultimatum. They even assumed the offensive, counting on their rapid successes to arrest England's arm. But it was, nevertheless, England that was obliged, in presence of this attitude which she could not tolerate, immediately to assume the offensive, and to make the astonishing and admirable effort which she has just shown to the world. But I maintain, and this I say because I am summing up multiple and absolutely competent views, that if, instead of flinging upon African soil 250,000 volunteers of every sort, she had transported thither a regular, well disciplined army, organized with the mathematical precision of Continental standing armies, an army, say, of 100,000 men, this would have largely sufficed, even in the immense extent of the field of the South African war, to bring the thing to a speedy end. For it is not merely the soldiers who would have been ready, by their serious military training, to cope with the difficulty, but also the great chiefs, whose military science would have been on a level with that of Continental generals, and we should not have witnessed the blunders which England's friends beheld with sorrow and even with dismay.

At the outset of the Transvaal war, I read in a foreign paper, the name of which I have forgotten, a letter from an English superior officer, indignantly repudiating the lessons which German officers pretended to give his English colleagues, and he said: "We need no lessons from the Germans. We are the hardest working and the best educated officers in the world." This is, no doubt, true. But it is perhaps in Thucydides that these officers have completed their education, and neither the repeating rifle, nor the quick-firing gun, nor smokeless powder, existed in the time of Thucydides; and the greatest warriors of ancient Greece would have been beaten, they and their heaviest hoplites, by a single modern French battery, by two battalions of Highlanders, or by two companies of German cuirassiers.

The formation of a standing army, based on compulsory serv-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ice, as numerous as her home defense, and the protection of her colonies and her possessions impose upon England, remains henceforth for her a question of life or death. Thus only can she attain the point reached by other nations in the scientific instruction of officer and soldier. Thus only can she impose upon the foreigner such respect as will secure her against insult or disdain, and thus only, being no longer exposed to the defiance implied in the haughty attitude of the nations, will she be able to preserve a lasting peace, because visibly prepared for modern warfare. And thus, little by little, the nation, feeling more and more deeply the pride of the flag, and having the proud consciousness of being obliged to defend it, will be penetrated by that general patriotism which regular soldiers, recruited from every corner of the nation and from all ranks, finally succeed in inculcating in every citizen.

Never before has a nation given us the spectacle of men occupying a high position or holding the ear of the public, accusing, insulting, castigating their own nation while it was engaged in a formidable struggle. Yet this is what we have been seeing of late and what we are still beholding in England.

I am told that these men, whose names I would not mention, disapproved or opposed the war before it broke out. That I believe, and I do not impute their attitude to them as a crime. But what history will inevitably castigate in them is that, after having failed in their opposition to the war, they should have subsequently covered their country with insults, while her sons were exposed to the enemy's bullets. This patricide policy will appear unpardonable in the eyes of future generations. If my father wishes to fight a duel, I may do all I can to prevent him, if his cause appears to me unjust; and, on condition that, in my remonstrances, I do not transgress the bounds of the respect which I owe him, no one can blame me for my attitude. But if, during the duel, while the swords are being crossed, while he offers his breast to his adversary's sword-point, I myself deal him a blow which he cannot anticipate from a son, I commit the most infamous and monstrous of treasons. And so I say, and repeat that, in no country where standing armies exist—armies, that is, in the veins of whose soldiers flows the blood of the entire nation—was ever such a monstrosity seen.

Thus, the standing army which I am defending here would be for England at once her force and security, and the source of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an unflinching patriotism, the elements of which at present she does not possess. No, when Mr. Chamberlain said, "I do not care about the opinion of foreigners," he uttered a monstrosity; and, worse than this, Mr. Chamberlain's words are but the expression of the secret thoughts of all English statesmen. The main cause, indeed, of the antipathy felt toward England all over the world, is just this disdain which British statesmen profess for foreign opinion.

Now, it is a dangerous, illogical thing to do, thus to provoke by disdain the irritation of the world, and to have at one's disposal for its repression only the quite insufficient weapon now at England's disposal, considering the multiple provocations to which she is exposed. Moreover, England should make no mistake. The colonies have displayed devotion and loyalty; and although an effort has been made to belittle the importance of the sacrifice which they have made for the mother country, yet, the very fact of such a spontaneous and decisive manifestation has been enough to attract everybody's attention, and to reveal the broad and experienced spirit and the lofty views with which England has treated the colonies.

This attitude of the colonies, however, is not merely a one-sided demonstration. It would imply, if need be, the obligation on the part of the mother country to fly effectively to the defense of her menaced colonies; and we behold once again, therefore, the imperative necessity, in spite of the disdainful attitude of her rulers, of the formation of an important standing army.

I shall not undertake here to indicate, in detail, how such an army should be recruited; but there is no reason why I should not, after careful reflection, say that this army ought to number at least 600,000 men in peace-time, and for the moment, at least, in war-time. England has in Egypt 6,000 English troops, against 25,000 or 30,000 Egyptian troops. This may have sufficed for hostilities with the Dervishes, the Soudan hordes or even Menelik's troops. But it would become quite inadequate in the case of war with the Mussulmans; and England, which would have then to rely upon herself alone, would require at least 40,000 men. For a long time to come, England will be bound to maintain in the Transvaal a regular, well-seasoned, well-disciplined army ready for battle, numbering at least 60,000 men. India demands of her 100,000; Ireland 60,000; 100,000 are necessary to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

meet all eventualities in the other colonies; 100,000 men are required in England and in Scotland, not to mention the mobile army of at least 100,000 men ready to be transported instantly, at home or abroad, to this or that point of her island coast, or of her dominions menaced over seas. So that, I repeat, she cannot get on without an army of 600,000 men and a corresponding military budget, if she wishes to keep herself intact, to say nothing of aggrandizement.

But I will go no farther. I shall not commit myself to any definite statement as to the mode of recruitment of this army, although, on the other hand, I should seem to be shirking a responsibility that I have freely assumed if I were not to state, just to discuss it, amend it, and complete it, later on, the system which I would myself prefer. My idea would be that this standing army should be formed by compulsory service based on the lot system, with facultative substitution. Military service would begin at twenty years of age. It would be active up to the age of twenty-five, with compulsory service in the reserve army from twenty-five to thirty. The active army, composed of 600,000 men, of which from 130,000 to 140,000 men would be recruited annually, would be permanent, with facilities for the temporary release from military obligations of 100,000 men, and, from the fifth year on, reserve forces also would reach the figure of 600,000 men. These troops would be called annually under the flag for a period of three weeks, and the economies resulting from the annual release of 100,000 men would meet the budgetary expenses annually for the reserve army. The rate for facultative substitution would be, in a country like England, relatively a high one, £160. This sum would be taken over by the State, which, at its risks and perils, would pay to the persons replacing their compatriots five per cent. annually. This, it should carefully be noted, only in the case of facultative substitution. This would amount to eight pounds a year, or thirteen shillings and four pence a month, or a supplementary payment of 5 1-3 pence per day. His service ended, the substitute would receive for his free disposal the sum paid in by the person whom he replaced. If he were in the colonies, or wished to settle there, he would not only be given a concession, but a sum would be advanced him on mortgage security, which, added to his substitute-rate, would allow him to settle down without fear of the future, and thereby

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

England would find herself gradually creating in her colonies, all over the world, farmers, tillers of the soil, and devoted and loyal subjects of the throne.

One might study the question of how to accumulate, for the soldiers of the regular army, a relatively modest sum, enabling them, at the end of their military service, to undertake in favorable circumstances the struggle for existence. These sums should be procured by means of the income tax, since it is for the security and tranquillity of those who live by their incomes that the soldiers of the regular army and their substitutes fight. Naturally, this system, like any other which might be sketched out, is merely an idea, which I venture to put forward, and I do not pretend that it is perfect nor yet applicable. But, as other systems may be proposed by competent men, I give this one here merely as a specimen, which I would not even undertake to defend, and which is capable of any or every modification, provided the formation of a standing army, recruited by compulsory service, energetically kept up to the level of military science, and alive to its duties toward the fatherland, be seriously effected.

II.

England has acted toward her diplomatic army as she has acted toward her military army. She has neglected its practical education. She has given it a bad organization. She has not accustomed it to regular and daily tasks; she has not taught it the social topography and the ethnography of the countries which she will have to fight. She has left the filling of the most important posts to caprice, to personal sympathies, or to considerations of birth. She has shifted to the South those who have failed in the North, and she has sent to the North those who failed in the South, as if the rebuffs of a diplomat were due to the climate and not to personal defects. And, finally, as in the case of her military army, she has organized neither the commissariat nor the armament, nor the ammunition necessary for an army constantly on the march and engaged daily with the enemy. The result is the inevitable one: England has been beaten everywhere.

English diplomacy everywhere is well-educated, punctual, obedient and discreet. It is well up in the treaties, it has an accurate knowledge of history. It knows the mooted points between the country that it represents and the country to which it is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

accredited. But it wears the indelible stamp of its origin. Its politeness is mathematical; its greetings traditional; its amiability theoretical. It executes with a marvellous mechanism the orders it receives; it transmits with a graphophonic accuracy the communications made to it. It is an admirable instrument in the hands of those who direct it. But it has an immense fault, which, in the eyes of those who govern it, is perhaps a quality: it is not automatic.

With the rarest of exceptions, it passes through the most varied posts, changing country, and habits, and climate, and relations, but even as it set out so it returns, and as it returns so fared it forth.

No one makes it confidences, for the simple reason that it attracts none, nor solicits any; and, as it obeys with precision orders not less precise, it cannot invite confidences, for it can make none.

The English are blamed for possessing an insular soul. English diplomacy is the quintessence of this soul; and the soul of an English diplomat, from the beginning to the end, is kneaded of that insularity of which every truly British soul is composed. No diplomacy in the world takes such frequent leaves of absence. During the numerous journeys I have made pretty much everywhere, I have never met English diplomats, of every rank and sort, save either going or coming from their posts to their homes and *vice versa*. It is an incessant *chassé-croisé*. And this is due to the fact that any English diplomat can replace a colleague, or be replaced by a colleague, their missions being cut out for them by an almost implacable precision, and their acts and movements being traced for them with such mathematical accuracy that they have only to be a docile instrument of good will to be able to fulfil every order, and without effort to fill any place left vacant by the chance absence of any member of a legation or embassy.

The insularity of English diplomacy has given it an inordinate liking for residence in England, with an antipathy, or at all events an indifference, for sojourn elsewhere. Nowhere in the world is there a city which offers to these condensed Englishmen the attraction of London, with its clubs, its rapid visits to the country-house, the after-dinner conversation with a cigar about the dinner tables; the thousand and one normal, uniform, changeless things of which, at determined hours, with an implacable regularity, with a regimentary rigidity, London life is composed, when everything one does, every habit adopted, every costume worn, is a shibboleth

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of one's *milieu* and "set." All these things have for the English diplomat abroad an irresistible and lasting charm. In the diplomatic post he holds, which he has coveted, because he desires absolutely and above all to preserve the classification belonging to him in society, every post is for him, not an exile, but a leave of absence, an obligatory sojourn, of which he supports courageously the load, but the weight of which he never ceases to feel.

What adds still more to the difficulties in the way of English diplomacy abroad, is that, like old men, at once presumptuous and naïve, it wishes to be liked and to make England liked solely for itself. With its lofty virtues, its rigid observance of the most austere laws and of public morality, it is reluctant to employ the ordinary methods, discountenanced by strict morals, employed by the other diplomacies throughout the world. It has no secret funds, and hardly possesses even the funds necessary to meet the requirements of its private police. The result we have seen a dozen times. We saw it when it was a question of creating bad blood between Germany and Russia; when it was a question of interrupting the march of Austria; when it was a question first of embittering and then of mitigating the relations between France and Italy; when it was a question of attenuating the Franco-German hatred, of confounding the interests of France and Russia, of separating those of England from those of Russia and France; and, finally, we beheld it triumphantly, irrefutably, when, in South African affairs, it was a question of arousing the whole world against England alone.

English diplomacy, in presence of the labors of the Transvaal agents during the long years in Austria, France, Germany, Russia and America, remained all but paralyzed, surprised, dumbfounded before it was able even to make the slightest movement of defense. England's projects were attacked, misconstrued, calumniated with startling unanimity, and not a single powerful voice dared to contradict the blunders, and confound calumniators.

I would not ruffle the austerity of English censors, nor revolt the modesty, the *pudor* of the Press Universal. I do not mean that it ought to have been, or ought to be, bought by ready money. In spite of all that has been said, and although journals and journalists have been mentioned publicly by name as having been quite ostensibly bribed by Rand gold and the Transvaal treasures, I do not believe it, and regard these assertions as libels. If

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

English diplomacy had been well informed, it would, in the first place, have known what was going on in the Transvaal, the preparations being made there, and the resources at the disposal, and the aims, of the Transvaal; all this it would have revealed to its government, which would have thus avoided the blunders into which it fell, and the calamities which England has undergone and is still undergoing. If English diplomacy had had the means of being well and exactly informed, it would, moreover, have revealed to its government the growth throughout the world of anti-English opinion, and, wherever it might be necessary, without bribing journals and journalists, it would have established powerful, enlightened, eloquent organs intended to combat vigorously error and to defend the truth.

I admit she would have spent some hundreds of thousands of pounds. I admit that she would have had to enter into the *mêlée*, undertake savage polemics in her battle with the contradictory opinions which she would have provoked. But she would have paralyzed the too facile enterprises of her country's foes. She would have prevented them from encouraging with impunity the aggressive arrogance of the Boers. She would have denounced and attacked the secret enrollment of soldiers throughout the world. She would have shown the Transvaal Republics the fallaciousness of the interventions on which they fancied they could count; and, even if she had been powerless to prevent the war, she would have had the means, the influence and the force necessary to prevent its prolongation, after the startling defeats which the English army has finally inflicted on the republican armies. In any case, if English diplomacy had been properly armed and provided with the "sinews of war," the conflict would long ago have been over. As the Transvaal war costs England £8,000,000 per month, if the action of her armed diplomacy could have abridged it by three months only, the £24,000,000 thus saved would have paid twenty times over for the secret funds that might have been placed at the disposal of this diplomacy.

The greatest diplomats of whom history has preserved the names have always held that one of the necessary conditions for a diplomacy really worthy of the name is mingling as actively as possible in the social and world-life of the country where it is established. It should try to know everything by listening to everything, and it should be able to listen to everything, because

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

able to be everywhere and to take part in everything. It should, therefore, have at its disposal all the means owing to which, in the most honorable or the most adroit way, a man has free entry wherever his presence can serve his objects and his duty as ambassador, not in order to listen behind closed doors, not to play the spy or to be a talebearer, but in order to breathe the ambient air in the midst of which he lives and moves, in order to become impregnated with the spirit of the country which it is his business to observe, and, if not to arrest, at least to canalize, the current which impels a government, a society or a nation toward an act of hostility against another government, nation or society.

English diplomacy has not all these resources and means at its disposal, and the consequence is that, everywhere, or almost everywhere, it lives as on an island which is difficult of access, and, in fact, whither access is facilitated only in official circumstances when no truth seeks to go ashore there, unless it be well disguised.

I have said enough for my readers to be able to complete my words by their personal conclusions. My opinion I have not to defend further. I merely hand it over to public discussion; and, if those who dispute me prove that they are right, I shall not undertake to defend an opinion which will have thus been shown to be false, nor to oppose views contrary to mine which shall thus have been shown to be true.

III.

It remains for me to touch upon a question which is at once delicate and rash, and which I would certainly not venture to discuss but for my desire to get at the truth, and my sincere friendship for England. For I feel that, in what I am about to say, I serve both the cause of England and that of peace, and consequently that of humanity as a whole.

A few years ago—in fact some long years now—I met at Naples, where he was taking a rest, the Duke of Fernand Nuñez, then retired to private life and seeking to recover his health. One day, the Duke said to me:

"When I was ambassador in Paris I called one day on the President of the Republic, and said to him, 'If your excellency could take in hand the cause of my country, and bring Spain back into the concert of the great European Powers, you would render so great a satisfaction to our legitimate pride, and do us so great a service, that we

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

should remain everlastingly loyal and grateful to your country. You would have in the Councils of Europe, whenever they might be convened, a constantly friendly and faithful voice to acquiesce in your opinion and espouse your interests. We are, in reality, a great nation. We deserve the epithet, and we are worthy to figure in the European concert. We are divided in appearance, but united in a common patriotism. Our pride would stop at nothing to spare the nation any humiliation. We are in reality rich, and our rise to the foremost rank would give us a feeling of unity which would soon induce us to prove that our prosperity justifies our ambitions and accounts legitimately for our pride. We have in the Antilles vast colonies, and the South American States are united to us by ethnic and linguistic bonds. Our exclusion from the European concert is an act of injustice which may become a danger. Take up our cause, and from the very fact that we are seated by the side of the great Powers around the green cloth, our attitude, our prudence and our loyalty will justify the honor done us in restoring us to the rank that is our due.' Some time afterward the President said to me: 'I was much struck by all you said to me. I have looked into the matter, and had my ministers do the same, and one of them, after having tried to obtain the opinion of the most powerful man in Europe, has brought me back this reply, which I am distressed to repeat to you: "Never will the great European Powers allow to form part of the European concert, in the foremost rank, a country that now for more than three-quarters of a century supports on its breast the knee-pan of the foreigners." ' And I, I replied: 'They are mistaken, and they insult us who fancy that we do not feel the humiliation inflicted on us, and that we need foreign opinion to impel us to be ready for every possible sacrifice, permitting us to rid ourselves of the secular burden weighing upon our consciences and making us breathe like those who pant.' "

I have since then a hundred times talked with Spaniards; and, whenever the conversation has fallen on this theme, I have surprised, according to the temperament of my interlocutors, sadness, sorrow, anger or exasperation painted on their faces, but never have I met with a Spaniard indifferent as to this subject when it was broached. "Gibraltar," as one of them, a statesman of mature age and experience, who played an active rôle in the conclusion of the recent peace, put it: "Gibraltar is a poniard, always plunged into a wound that has never been healed. We do not scream out our pain, but we never cease to feel it."

I quite understand that the English reader who has now an inkling of my thesis, without having given it as yet any serious thought, and without comprehending the full bearing of my words, should utter a cry of protest. "Malta and Gibraltar are our strong points of defense in the Mediterranean, our preliminary ports to Alexandria. They are ports of refuge for our vessels, our indispensable coaling stations, and centres of armament

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and provision. Without Gibraltar and Malta, we should be neither at Port Said, nor at Alexandria, no longer masters of our water routes, and we might at any moment be exposed to the gravest risks. We never had the pretension, in occupying Gibraltar, of preventing the passage of vessels through the straits; but, knowing that we are secure there at Gibraltar, we can, if need be, sustain a struggle which we would not dare undertake if we did not feel ourselves protected by its guns."

So be it, and I risk arousing all sorts of outcries and contradictions, in depriving the English reader of his illusions as to the real effective value at present of Gibraltar.

Some time ago, I chanced to be on the Franco-Spanish frontier. I wished to form an idea of the real dispositions of Catalonia. I omit for the time being all mention of what I then learned in Catalonia itself; but what struck me is that, on Spanish territory, the fort of Guadaloupe, a formidable point commanding almost impregnably the course and the valley of the Bidassoa, was absolutely disarmed, or rather not armed, and that nothing prevented a French army entering Spain from this side. When I expressed my surprise, I was told that it was quite the same thing from the Bidassoa to the confines of the Franco-Spanish frontiers, that everywhere the forts commanding the frontier were unarmed. I sought to discover why Spain left its frontiers thus open on the French side, and this is what I was told:

"You know that on the other side of Gibraltar and at the extremity of the separating bay is the port of Algeciras, which, like Gibraltar, lies opposite Ceuta. England has spent three or four millions of pounds in the construction of docks on the side of the Bay of Algeciras. When these docks were constructed, the Spaniards had the idea of fortifying Algeciras, San Felipe, Majorca, Rocadillo, Almirante and other points of the same sort along the inner coast line of the bay. England succeeded in preventing this scheme by showing Spain that such a project would be regarded by her as an act of aggression against England, for her docks were, owing to the distance, at present out of the range of the guns of Algeciras, but that this would no longer be the case if intermediary points closer at hand were to be put in a state of defense. In presence of her energetic representations, Spain abandoned the idea of fortifying these points on the Bay of Algeciras, between that port and Gibraltar, and England, reassured, made no further demands. France, however, aware of these incidents, also resisted the idea of the arming of the Spanish fortresses on the Franco-Spanish frontier, and obtained from Spain the promise that the valleys of the Pyrenees, Bidassoa and the rest should not be exposed to the guns of the Spanish fortresses."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Such is the explanation given to me of the defenseless state of the Spanish frontier bordering upon France.

Now, the Transvaal war has proved many things, but one of its first results is to upset completely the theories hitherto adopted, and to destroy most oddly the results obtained by England in preventing Spain from fortifying the intermediary points of the Bay of Algeciras, between Algeciras and Gibraltar. England, of course, fancied, in obtaining this concession, to protect Gibraltar eventually against Spanish guns. But the Transvaal war has shown the transportability and the facility of provisional and effective installation of the heaviest artillery, at any point desired, and near enough for effective attack. The Boers transported their "Long Tom" as they might have transported a piano. They established it as solidly in the depths of the valleys as on the summits of the kopjes; and, in a word, the heaviest artillery, guns comparable with the most formidable pieces of modern fortresses, can be carried to-day, at will, to any point which the assailant may choose. The result is that the Spaniards now have the certainty that, if need be, they could establish the centre of their heaviest artillery at the point which appeared to them the most suitable, and that, if ever the time comes, for any reason whatever, as a consequence of a series of events now foreseen or not yet foreseen, when they would be called upon to enter upon a struggle in order to wrest the poniard from the wound which has never healed, the docks imprudently constructed under the shelter of Gibraltar would be within the range of their guns, and to protect them England would have to abandon them altogether, and make ruinous outlays to establish them on the opposite side, just under the artillery of Gibraltar, since the hinterland of Gibraltar, as well as the bay of Algeciras, belongs to Spain.

What I mean, therefore, and what I say without pretension, as any one may perceive, of establishing a technical theory which is beyond all criticism and refutation, is that to-day Gibraltar is no longer the impregnable fortress that it was, that the English docks would not be sheltered from the guns of the Bay of Algeciras, and that the hinterland of Gibraltar belongs to Spain. If Spain, for instance, in order to recover Gibraltar, hesitating before no sacrifice, were to make common cause with France, Gibraltar might be attacked from all sides, by sea and by land, by the combined armies of the hitherto hypothetical allies, by the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

already existing fleet of France and by the future fleet of Spain, which is reconstructing her sea forces and has entrusted the task to France. I may add that Gibraltar, with a population which, in such an eventuality, would nowhere find a sure means of egress, is a *place-fort* requiring a formidable garrison, the very alimentation of which, coupled with that of the population, would form a crushing burden, difficult even for England.

I am quite aware, and every one well knows, that a Franco-Spanish alliance is at present merely an hypothesis. There are, however, certain grounds for supposing that it is not so chimerical as might be believed. France, of late, has manifested toward Spain the most kindly and most practical feelings of good will. She has concluded with Spain a commercial agreement very favorable to the latter. She has powerfully assisted Spain in the so difficult undertaking of the conversion of its debt. She has aided it in keeping an eye upon Catalonia, as regards the introduction of arms, during the recent piteous failure of Carlism in that province. Everything, in a word, goes to show that the most friendly relations subsist between these two Latin nations.

My meaning, therefore, is that the comfortable point of control held by England at Gibraltar has become of doubtful efficacity, and that this point might become for her, at a given moment, an element of weakness instead of strength.

Note that I have not supposed, for a moment, that England could abandon or simply restore Gibraltar, without exchange or compensation, thus weakening her power in the Mediterranean. No. But men of the highest authority, Englishmen as well as foreigners, Spaniards of the highest competence and intelligence, as well as English engineers of the most serious reputation, all have assured me that England to-day would gain by the exchange, if, for Gibraltar, Spain were to give her Ceuta. To shift the present Gibraltar docks out of the range of the guns of the Bay of Algeciras, England would have to spend four or five millions of pounds. And if in possession of Ceuta, in exchange for Gibraltar, she were to spend there the amount of money which the displacement of her Gibraltar docks would cost her, she would render Ceuta the most formidable, the safest, the most easily defendable, and the most suitable situation for her own defense in the Mediterranean, and on the very spot even where it is a question of protecting Morocco against the appetites of the world.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Moreover, such an act, such an abandonment, or rather such an exchange, would, as the Duke of Fernand Nuñez said, make Spain the most devoted, the most grateful and the most loyal friend of England; and the latter, which, very rightly, complains of the pretty general ill-will and almost uniform hostility against her, would find in this new friendship a consoling compensation for the unjust suspicions of which she is the victim. Certainly, if, as all the Spaniards with whom I have ever conversed have assured me, Spain feels so poignantly the state of things at Gibraltar, she will exchange Gibraltar for Ceuta with enthusiasm; and, if she refused to do so, it would be either because she is no longer free to do so, or because her distress, her irritation and sense of humiliation are no longer so profound as she pretends; and, in either case, my proposition evidently could not or should not be realized. But, if Spain is free to treat with England, if she is free to give England, in exchange for her recovered pride, not to speak of Ceuta, what the sincere friendship of a new ally can offer to a great country, I need no longer insist on what I have just been saying. Spain apparently is living in a state of sincere and lasting friendship with England. If, by the retrocession, or rather by the exchange of Gibraltar for Ceuta, England were to become veritably the friend and ally of a devoted Spain, she would at the same time annul the danger lurking in the question of Morocco's becoming a formidable apple of discord, around which might be let loose a universal war. So that thus also would England enormously serve her own ends, render a service no less great to Spain, render a service to the peace of the world, and aggrandize herself as well as Spain. And if all this be possible, it is needless to add any fresh arguments to those I have already given.

And now let me say this: I have sought to show in language, it may be, void of all precaution, what I said at the outset, to-wit: that England needs a well-disciplined standing army; an armed diplomacy, and, as a complement, the conquest of an ally. If my words bear fruit, I shall be still more happy than proud; if they are repudiated, treated with irony, or combated, I shall, nevertheless, have done what I felt to be my duty, and I shall stand by, a witness of any events that may occur, saying to myself, struck by the futility of all efforts: *Alea jacta est.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE PEKIN RELIEF EXPEDITION.

BY CAPTAIN WILLIAM CROZIER, U. S. A., CHIEF ORDNANCE OFFICER ON THE STAFF OF GENERAL CHAFFEE, COMMANDER OF THE AMERICAN CONTINGENT IN THE RECENT EXPEDITION FOR THE RELIEF OF PEKIN.

THE readers of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW are familiar with the history of the Pekin Relief Expedition. It will be recalled that the advance to Pekin was commenced on August 4th, having been preceded by the failure of the Seymour relief column, the capture of the Taku Forts and the battle at Tientsin. The nations represented in the advance were Japan, Russia, England, France and the United States. The French force which started with the expedition was small and was left on the fourth day out at Yangtsun, to guard the railroad crossing of the Peiho at that place. At Tung Chow, thirteen miles from Pekin, a mountain battery with about a hundred infantry, commanded by a Major General, again joined the column. The combatant force available was composed of approximately 8,000 Japanese, commanded by General Yamagutchi; 4,000 Russians, commanded by General Llinevitch, and 2,500 each of British and Americans, commanded respectively by Generals Gaselee and Chaffee. No common commander was chosen; the different contingents cooperating whilst retaining their independence. It fell out that the British, Japanese and Americans usually acted together, as did the Russians and the French. That this not very military arrangement resulted in no compromise of the success of the expedition was due probably to the fact that as a fighting task the job was not a hard one, there not being an active and courageous enemy to confront. The principal concern of each general was to keep his troops supplied and to get them into efficient condition

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

through the hardships of the trying march. The Japanese being the most numerous force, and being composed of troops of the three arms of the service in good proportion, and having a properly organized staff, lacked nothing necessary for independent action; their reconnaissances were always the most extensive and their information the most complete. Without the least tendency toward assumption they thus fell naturally into a position of initiative, and took a leading part in arranging the order of march and of battle. The British force also comprised infantry, cavalry and artillery; that portion which remained continually with the expedition consisted entirely of Indian troops. The Americans had the 9th Infantry, the 14th Infantry, a battalion of marines and Light Battery F of the 5th Artillery. Without cavalry they were deprived of tactical eyes and ears, and being thus dependent on others for information, and having too small numbers to act otherwise than as a compact unit, their only course was to fall in with the plans which were made for them. These always assigned to them a dignified part and involved a full share of the fighting. The Russians had with them infantry and artillery and a small number of cavalry; the French, infantry and artillery.

The first engagement was at Peitsang, and was fought, practically, by the Japanese; the others would have been glad to take a more effective part, but the nerve of the Chinamen was not sufficient to provide fighting enough to go around, and the Japanese, being in advance, got it all. On the following day occurred the combat of Yangtsin, at which the supply of fighting was again short, and the Americans and British, having the advance, got practically all there was. Pekin was entered on August 14th, when all the forces were engaged except the British, who, after all, were the first to enter the legation enclosure; and on the 15th the Americans took the Imperial City, carrying the five successive gates leading through it into the Forbidden City. A fortnight afterward the Forbidden City was formally entered.

Knowing the salient facts of the expedition and something of the manner of their accomplishment, the reading public is now in position to take an interest in a comparison of the attributes and methods of the different forces. Comparisons have already been begun by different observers and are characterized by a mixture of praise with some very sharp blame. Most of the praise, as well as a small portion of the blame, is given to the soldier, and perhaps

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by inference to his officer in the line, while, as is the fashion, the staff, in most accounts and current comments, comes in for tremendous rating in which there is no admixture of praise. Blame is wholesome, but in order that profit shall be taken from it it is necessary that it be bestowed with proper, not to say expert, discrimination, else we shall fail to make the right corrections.

To begin with the Subsistence Department, it is borne in upon the campaigner that the eatables and drinkables, if not the most important, are at least the most continuously insistent, of the indispensables. Of these there was an ample supply at Tientsin from the time of the arrival there of the first American troops; and they included not only the ordinary components of the ration but most of the delicacies classed as fancy groceries. Ginger ale and bottled waters were in abundance, and plenty was the order of the day. The food of our soldiers exceeded in quantity, quality and variety that of any of the allied forces, as was the comment of all foreign officers under whose notice it fell. When the march to Pekin was taken up, however, the fare was less generous. All supplies directly accompanying the troops had to be carried in wagons or on pack mules, and of these means of transportation the command was very short, having sufficient only for carrying three days' rations and one hundred rounds of reserve ammunition per man; but, in common with the other contingents, we had a reserve supply of rations and ammunition following upon junks by the Peiho, of which the course was in the general direction of the march as far as Tung Chow, within thirteen miles of Pekin. Such luxuries as tents, however, were out of the question, officers and men sleeping in the open air and taking the rain as it came.

The ration thus carried was reduced to about three pounds per man—the full ration in bulk with its packing cases weighing about five pounds per man—and comprised the staples: bacon, hard bread, sugar, coffee, rice, beans and condiments. Even so, it was better than was carried for the troops of any other nation; the Japanese had only rice and dried fish, the Indian troops mainly rice, the others a variety and quantity approaching, but not equalling, those of the Americans. No provision was made for supplying the United States troops on the march with water other than the canteen which each man carried. Other troops were better off in this respect; the British Indians carried water in skins on pack mules, and some had barrels upon carts. But

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there are wells in all the Chinese villages, and these, along the line of march, were not more than a mile and a half apart; and, with the column properly halted, it is as easy to fill canteens from a stationary well as from a stationary cart or mule. The water in the wells was always cool, and, though seldom perfectly clear it was never revoltingly turgid, as was that of the river and canals; it was drunk freely by all the troops of the expedition. No other troops made such a time about water as the Americans, who had orders to drink none without boiling it, and had special utensils provided for the purpose. These orders could not be enforced, however, as thirsty soldiers will not wait, even when arrived in camp, for water to boil and cool. Portable filters were provided and were used in the hospital service; one also I observed in the Light Battery and one was in the headquarters mess. The characteristic ailment of north China, however, seems to come independently of the water; it attacks nearly all Europeans and Americans during their first summer, not sparing even those who drink nothing but imported waters. With careful inquiry I was unable to find a medical man who could assign a satisfactory reason, other than that it was "in the air."

I have neither heard nor read any criticism of the operations of the Subsistence Department other than as these were affected by lack of transportation, which suggests inquiry as to the character and quantity of the latter. The Americans had thirteen four-mule army-wagons and one pack train of forty freight mules, besides two or three ambulances and a Dougherty wagon. The four-mule wagon is considered to be distinctly superior to the means of transportation of supplies employed by any other nation. Loaded with 3,000 pounds of freight, and often with more, it made light of everything in the way of obstacles which the roads offered, and was much more economical, in both men and animals, than the two-wheeled, one-horse carts of the Japanese and Russians, with a driver for each vehicle. The latter would have been overloaded with more than 600 pounds each, of which, for a ten days' march, 150 pounds would have to be reserved for the food and baggage of the horse and man, leaving only 450 pounds of useful freight; whereas the four-mule wagon carries 2,580 pounds of useful freight, so that transporting power in carts equivalent to that of one wagon, four animals and one man would require five and three-quarters vehicles, animals and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

men, costing much more and occupying twice the space on the road. The Japanese pack trains were organized with a man for each pony, who led him on the march; in the Indian pack trains, one man riding a mule led three other mules; the American train had one man to four mules, all of the loaded animals being driven in a bunch with a bell mare leading. Here also was economy of men, although perhaps the Japanese provision of a man to each animal was a necessity, as their ponies are all stallions, and their train, at a halt, was a bedlam of flying heels and wild snorts; it was more dangerous to pass than a Chinese outpost. A large proportion of the Japanese transportation consisted of pack animals; the British Indians had nothing else; the inferiority in economy, when contrasted with the American system, is striking when it is noted that it requires the same number of mules to carry 1,000 pounds on packs as will haul 3,000 pounds in our army-wagon. The American pack train carried ammunition only, for which purpose it could not have been replaced, as it afforded the only means of maintaining a first reserve supply in constant readiness for immediate distribution to the firing line. The pack saddles of the different nationalities were, in their effect on the animals, of about equal merit. Occasional sore backs were noticed in all the trains; but the American required the most skillful packer.

The indispensable *impedimenta* of troops in the field are always the occasion of delay in active operations. All the American troops which started for Pekin on August 4th were at Tientsin by July 27th, except the Light Battery, which arrived on August 3rd; but the only vehicles for transportation were those which had been sent over in June with the Ninth Infantry. Others which followed the Fourteenth Infantry from Manila on the transport "Wyfield" were still aboard that vessel in Taku Bay, awaiting unloading and shipment up the river by the scanty means which, in the keen competitive press for them, had only been secured by energy and enterprise on the part of the Quartermaster's Department. The pack train arrived on the morning of August 4th, was loaded at the railroad station from the accumulation which it had been impossible to transport to the camp, and started with the expedition in the afternoon. Investigating the reasons for the lack of transportation, the facts show that the first troops sent over, the Ninth Infantry, had been abund-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

antly supplied, but that this supply was subsequently stretched to take care of two regiments of infantry, a battalion of marines, a light battery and the headquarters. If it be asked why the additional troops did not have their own means of transportation immediately after their arrival, it must be remembered that an improvement in transportation conditions could have been insured only by the maintenance at Manila of a thoroughly provided depot for the dispatch of military expeditions, regarding the Philippines as an outpost for guarding the interests of the United States in the far East and equipping it accordingly.

The shortness of the American transportation, however, was at no time the cause of delay; while the advance to Pekin from Tung Chow, the place where connection with the junks was finally broken, was delayed from the 12th till the 13th because of the plea of the Russians that their transportation had not yet come up. The large numbers of missionaries' families and other refugees and entrapped visitors, especially the ladies, who were sent down from Pekin a day or two after its relief, owed the comfort of their journey to Tung Chow to the American ambulances and other vehicles, which were the only ones in that part of the world fit to ride in. Within three days after the arrival at Pekin fancy groceries and bottled waters began to make their appearance in the American commissary, and within a week there was abundance of these for all.

A radical feature of the Japanese and British Indian organization is the employment in large numbers of auxiliary troops, or coolies, approximating fifty per cent. of the fighting force. Most of these accompany the baggage train and are used in drawing carts or as bearers, and they do the general work of the camps. Their employment may be justified in countries where men are cheap, and good animals and vehicles scarce, but it does not make for economy; their own rations and baggage have to be carried along, and if used as bearers they are more fatigued upon arrival in camp than the fighting troops, and, therefore, not in condition to work for the latter. During prolonged rests, it is well for soldiers to take care of themselves; the considerable number of coolies employed by the American forces in China and the Philippines, as litter bearers, etc., were believed by the officers to exercise a demoralizing effect upon the men, who were apt to develop an inability to carry a bucket of water or clean a gun.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If a sufficient number of four-mule wagons, the most rapid and economical transportation yet devised for countries in which they can go at all—and with a little help they can do marvels in the way of trail covering—be supplied to carry all the men's baggage except their arms and canteens, and in addition a sufficient number of armed men to act as train guards, riding either on the seats with the drivers or on others provided, these men would be sufficiently fresh to do the loading and other extra work, and the whole organization would be much more economical and serviceable than one provided with coolie corps.

From a competitive criticism of arms and personal and horse equipments, the American force comes out well; the infantry rifle, with some instances of remarkable endurance, sustained the reputation which it had acquired in Cuba and the Philippines. At Tientsin, when the troops crawled through the mud and lay in it for hours, the rifles became completely clogged; but, by taking them by the muzzle and swishing them through the water for a few seconds, they were restored to perfect action. The thimble belt, used only by the Americans, is still preferred to the cartridge pouches of the others. Our field artillery was as good as any there, although there was none of the most modern design, with its special effort to increase rapidity of fire by reducing the recoil of the carriage to a minimum. The McClellan saddle would fit anything from the largest sized American horse in good condition to a Chinese donkey, three feet high, in the last stages of emaciation; and allow either to be ridden without producing a sore back. No other hospital corps was provided with such means for transporting sick and wounded as our ambulances; the British doolies, or heavy, curtained litters carried by four men, were a poor substitute, and, considered as litters, were only half as economical of men as ours, which required only two.

In United States base and temporary hospitals, the patients were on cots; in the Japanese, they were on the floor, an illustration of the greater requirements—and their supply—of the American soldier. No other hospitals, either, had women nurses.

The shoes, hats, uniforms of the American troops, were not such as any would wish to exchange for those of the patterns used in other services, and no failure in their serviceable qualities was developed. The horses were coarse brutes compared with the high-class animals ridden by the English officers and the Bengal

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lancers, but in regard to its other war material the United States has learned no lesson of inferiority.

In regard to military organization, the same cannot be said. The other forces showed evidence of preparedness and readiness, resulting from the fact that each unit, as well as the general command, was complete with its transportation, drilled auxiliaries and staff assistants, all organized and accustomed to act together; while the American troops had to be sent as small independent units to China, to be there brought into relations with their staff and organized as a mobile force. It was again proved that our staff departments are of inadequate numbers. General Chaffee had to take his Adjutant-General from one of his line regiments, his Inspector-General from another, also his Chief Quartermaster of the expedition, as well as other officers for various staff duties; thus robbing the line, as we always do at the time when it can least spare its officers, depleted as it now is also by the officers required for the volunteer army. I do not think I am mistaken in saying that, of the two infantry regiments which marched to Pekin, not one company possessed its full complement of officers, and that the majority had only one of the three allowed. We have no organized staff for purely military purposes disconnected from supply, such as collecting and disseminating information, arranging the details of movements, supervision of the condition of the forces, etc. The Adjutant-General's and Inspector-General's Departments and the Engineer Corps have, scattered among them, many of the elements of such duty, and there is nothing in our organization to prevent the first department from taking it up; but its officers are far too few for the purpose, even if they were selected with special reference to it; and in the field they, or the ones detailed for their work, speedily find all their time required to keep the orders, correspondence and records from hopeless confusion. When the hampering conditions under which it worked are appreciated, credit should be given by the country to the administration of the War Department for putting into the field, as promptly as it did, a force of respectable numbers, which was able to give a good account of itself. What could have been done without the Philippine base, forms a fit subject for reflection, when it is understood that every soldier, every pound of ammunition and supplies, and every wheel of transportation which reached China in time to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

start on the relief expedition, came from that possession; lacking which, we would have been unable, like the Germans, to render effective co-operation in the relief of our people.

Another respect in which the United States force does not well bear comparison with the others, is that of the smartness and soldierly conduct of the troops. Both in China and on the way there, at Nagasaki, the men in going about were utterly careless as to their dress and bearing. The Japanese and Sikhs, at the rendezvous, in the camps and at Pekin, whenever seen in public, wore their uniforms complete and properly put on, carried themselves with military bearing and were careful in saluting officers; and the heavy and somewhat awkward Russians, while not presenting so trim an appearance, were particular in these respects. American soldiers off duty walked around or rode in rickshaws without blouses, belts or leggings; with shirts open at the throat and breast, the sleeves unbuttoned and rolled up to different heights, or perhaps one flapping, and with the military-looking campaign hat worn in every shape and at every angle. Such sights were common. The American soldiers were the slouchiest of all, except the French. At Nagasaki, in addition to disregard of the arrangement of such portion of the uniform as they might have on, many were to be seen wearing travellers' caps of various shapes and styles. Their carelessness as to saluting officers must have caused some wonder among the people of the military nation considered to have recently emerged from barbarism, and among the Indian soldiers of lower civilization. The horse equipments of the British officers and of the Bengal Lancers were always cared for and neat, the leather having good surface and the metal shining. Let an American officer try to imagine one of our soldiers polishing a steel bit on a campaign! The belts and shoulder-pieces of the British officers were of uniform pattern, made to carry certain articles which they all had. American officers carried what they liked—usually a field glass and a pistol, the latter on such belt as suited their fancy. It is not intended to convey the impression that the American troops constituted anything like a mob; their control was never in the least degree out of hand, and they showed themselves, as heretofore, perfectly subject to such discipline as was exacted. They were the most intelligent of all the troops forming the expedition, as was strikingly apparent from observation of their faces at the good oppor-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tunity afforded by the march past the staff at the entry of the Forbidden City, on which occasion also their neatness and fine appearance were most gratifying. For such slackness as is here noted, the fault lies with the officers, the men being in this respect what the officers make them. They come from a people who are not in the habit of considering smartness as a necessary accompaniment of efficiency, but who, having only recently gone through the process of reclaiming a wild country, in which much had to be accomplished with little, have a high appreciation of the rough and ready, which they reflect. Americans have a tendency to stand up and fight, for which we are to thank God; it is for military training to give this quality its best chance of successful exhibition, by adding to it every feature which the best talent of the world judges useful in the composition of the soldier. Elements of the training are evidently lacking in our soldiers, and it is pertinent to ask why. Every regular regiment has now among its officers a good proportion of graduates of West Point, who, alone, would represent the knowledge of what constitutes a soldier's duty and contributes to his efficiency. Why is this knowledge not applied? In China, it certainly was not because of indifference on the part of the commander, whose own impulses are all the other way—but it would have been impossible for him, with the responsibility of the expedition upon his shoulders, to produce an excellence of detail of which the spirit did not pervade the commissioned mass. I believe the answer to be, that the constant thought, attention and effort required cannot be secured without stimulus, and that stimulus is lacking in our service. It may not be generally appreciated how little power exists, under our laws, to reward meritorious officers, or to place subordinate command in the hands of the most efficient. The President selects general officers and the appointees to some of the staff departments; there his power stops. All promotion in these departments and throughout the line is strictly by seniority; the efficient and the inefficient, the careless and the attentive, the sober and the intemperate advancing equally; if an officer avoids a court-martial the rest follows. There is no effective process of elimination of the inefficient; officers are examined for promotion, and if they cannot pass are supposed to go out of the service; but in the ten years of the operation of the law upon the subject, there is no single instance

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of an officer having been deprived of his commission by its application, except for physical incapacity. Not only has merit no influence in the advancement of officers, but in normal times the natural rate of promotion is so slow that all officers become too old for their grades, and are apt to lose interest in the duties. This results from the small proportion of high to low officers in a military organization, and can be corrected only by artificial elimination, *i. e.*, the application of a method by which a sufficient number of officers, preferably the least efficient, shall retire from active service—such a rule as exists in every military and naval service of the world, with the sole exception of the army of the United States. The table below shows the ages at which officers can hope, under existing laws, to attain the various grades:

First Lieutenant	at	31.1	years.
Captain	"	43.5	"
Major	"	57.1	"
Lieutenant-Colonel	"	60.9	"
Colonel.	"	62.25	"

The figures show the average ages for all officers of the staff and line; their discouraging character is apparent, and receives illustration in the case of Captain H. J. Reilly, the commander of the American Light Battery, who was killed while directing the fire of his guns at the taking of the Imperial City. He was of the class of officers who can ill be spared; under his efficient command the battery had achieved a reputation in the Philippines, and during this expedition it had always been found where it was wanted, ready to do what was expected of it. His death as a Captain, after thirty-three years of service, was an honor to himself, but was a discredit to the system which kept an officer of his well-known merit in low grades for such a length of time. I believe the material of our army, both officers and men, to be the best in the world. No other nation has company officers of the average ability and education of our own; but the superiority shades away as their service progresses, and they get farther away from the rigorous system of stimulus and selection which spurred and winnowed them at the Military Academy, and which in other services is continued through all grades.

At the instance of the War Department, a bill was introduced in Congress at its last session designed to correct some of these evils; it provided that one promotion out of every three in the line should be made by selection, and that the selection should be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

primarily in the hands of the officers themselves of the branch of the service concerned, a board of whom would submit three names to the President, who would from these make the promotion. The latter feature was to meet the objection of the Army, that selections made, as have been most of those for the staff departments, would be through political influence and not for merit. Another provision was that appointments for service in the staff departments would be made by boards of officers of those departments, without the feature of the submission of three names to the President. The subject of artificial elimination was not dealt with.

Administrations confronted with military difficulties are usually embarrassed by the insufficient number of troops, and, being themselves temporary, have strong reason for devoting their attention to the increase of the size of the army rather than to the introduction of reforms of permanent though slower benefit; the more especially as the augmentation itself carries a transient improvement in quality by promoting younger officers and affording, usually, occasion for the exercise of selection—the patched-up machine will tide over the emergency, and the unremoved deteriorating influences will not produce their old effect until it shall have become the instrument of other hands. But here was a case in which an administration made its first concern quality and not size, as far as the measure it recommended affects the greater part of the army, and it should have received corresponding encouragement. Far be from me the Cassandra task of attempting to persuade my countrymen that an army of any given size is a necessity for the Republic; if the views of certain persons upon this subject be correct, events will demonstrate it, and if the demonstration be accompanied by a lesson I have no doubt that it will be pluckily, if not good naturedly, received. But I believe that the people strongly desire that the military establishment which they are willing to pay for shall be of good quality, and I make this my apology for my representing that, unless reforms embodying principles similar to those above outlined be instituted, full efficiency will not be attained, and our army will continue to compare unfavorably with those of other nations.

There are many minds to which, in looking over the progress of the campaign, will be suggested the inquiry: What valuable

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

contribution has its conduct made to the cause of humanity in warfare? With so many nations acting together, what examples have they been able to afford each other of the successful use of methods designed to cause the distress of war to bear only on the combatant forces and governments, to the exclusion, as far as possible, of peaceful inhabitants? Immediately upon arrival it became necessary to employ largely native labor; this labor was always impressed, if not to be had voluntarily, but from the beginning it was paid for by the Americans at a satisfactory rate—twenty Mexican cents, ten cents American, with rice ration, per day. This practice was eventually adopted by all, but was said not to be followed for some time by several of the Powers. Private property, horses, carts, provisions, &c., were taken for public use, sometimes with compensation, oftentimes not, at least in the earlier stages. But in regard to the general matter of payment for value received, it is to be believed that, after the initial disorderly period was passed and a certain regularity and order had been established, the principle was quite generally observed. In regard to the personal treatment of non-combatants and wounded, much good cannot be said. The circumstances of the expedition were not such as to predispose the troops to a feeling of consideration toward the Chinaman, whose barbarous treatment of missionaries and their families was well known throughout the force; and the more or less popular character of the society guilty of it tended to involve the population in the detestation justly provoked, so that personal hostility prevailed to a much greater extent than in the case of an ordinary war between States. The majority of the natives had no other desire than that of safety for themselves and their belongings, and were willing to do anything to placate whatever party might be in local power; but this disposition, while saving them from continued cruelty, did not induce careful discrimination in the heat of an exciting situation. With all the explanation that can be made, stories of inexcusable brutalities were current throughout the camps, some indicating the loose rein to passions, others mere brutishness. None of the worst class of cases came under my personal observation, and all stories should be received with caution. One was told me by a fellow staff officer of the American Commander and is as worthy of complete credence as any testimony can be. He related that, while riding by a Russian

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

column on the march, he saw a soldier violently kick a child of some eight years, who was sitting on the edge of the road; and, as the blow of the heavy boot turned the child's body, he kicked him again in the face, sending him over backward into the corn. The assault was murderous, and could scarcely have had less effect than the permanent loss of the boy's eyesight; it was seen by the rest of the Russian column without other mark than of amusement, although from the formation there must have been officers near enough to have witnessed the act. At Tung Chow, while riding with a group of officers, one of them exclaimed: "Look at that dreadful thing!" Glancing up, I saw a commotion among a small group of Russian soldiers about seventy yards away, and it was explained that they had just dragged a Chinaman from the grass and stabbed him with bayonets. I did not see the act itself nor investigate it further, and am not a good witness as to the murder, the occurrence of which, however, I do not doubt. While riding alone about Tung Chow on the day of its entry, I found in an empty compound a Chinese coolie, lying face down, bound hand and foot, with his head brought back by his queue, which was tied to his hands, and his hands then tied to a fence. He was unconscious and breathing, but with a bullet through his body and no chance for his life. I cut him loose and arranged him so that he might die comfortably. Returning some time after, I found him apparently gone, but with some Japanese soldiers poking him with sticks to see if they could prod him into a sign of life. I, of course, knew nothing of the circumstances under which he got into the state in which I found him; he may have been guilty of the exasperating offense of "sniping." During the entire advance, and for a fortnight after, dead bodies of coolies floating in the river and lying about in odd places gave evidence of killing which must have been unjustifiable. Crimes against women were told of, including one instance of horrible cruelty to a husband who had interfered; but there is no reason for believing that these cases were more numerous than is inevitable under the circumstances, or that there was toleration for the offenses. One American soldier was brought to trial and conviction, and received a sentence of twenty years' imprisonment, and there were reports of just punishment in other commands. As to the wounded on the field of battle, there was general expectation of no quarter on either side; but, as none of the foreign wounded

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fell into the hands of the Chinese, and as the latter usually got off while the invaders were far enough away to give them time to remove theirs, there was not much opportunity for the application of the pleasant principle. One instance came practically under my observation. At Peitsang, I was at the Chinese outpost at the powder depot almost immediately after its capture by the Japanese; Chinese soldiers apparently dead were lying about. As I rode along the embankment, I saw a Japanese soldier ahead hastily putting a cartridge into his gun, and after having passed him I heard the discharge. Calling back to my orderly asking what he had fired at, the reply was that he had fired down into a trench; for which there could have been but one object, although neither of us saw it. The justification for this was held to be that the Boxers and their sympathizers were fanatics whose dearest object was to kill foreigners, and that they would do what they could toward its accomplishment as long as life was left in them. Riding over the field a few minutes after this occurrence, I passed two wounded Chinamen in the grass, but their bloodthirsty enthusiasm, if they had had it, had waned, as they made no hostile demonstration.

Of looting there was much. Tientsin was thoroughly looted. At Pekin there were no guards to prevent it until the day after the hands of the American force had been freed by the capture of the Imperial City. The earliest and most persistent looters were the Chinese themselves, either the soldiery and Boxers or the inhabitants. As soon as they considered the proper period to have arrived, they commenced operations and were willing to take high risks in carrying them on. The British looted openly and systematically, the plunder being turned in to a common store from which auction sales were held each afternoon at the British legation, under the direction of an officer; the proceeds to be used for the benefit of the soldiers. Other nationalities were believed to have imposed little check. When the city was divided up, the Americans placed guards over the portion assigned to them and quickly put a stop to disorderly proceedings. Their commanding general was strongly opposed to looting, as to all other forms of abuse of the natives; and he issued stringent orders in regard thereto, in the spirit of which he was supported by the officers, whose duties were lightened by the fact that robbery and cruelty are not found in the grain of the Ameri-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can soldier. Although some looting was done by Americans, it is believed to have been very much less than that by any other troops of the expedition.

Incendiary fires were common, and the route to Pekin can be said to have been marked by burning villages. No instance is known of Americans starting these fires; and, in general, it is believed that the record of the Americans for humanity is indisputably better than that of any other troops.

On the whole, the campaign cannot be said to have marked for the foreign powers an advance in the diminution of the horrors of war, but must be recognized as rather a step backward; notwithstanding which, its conduct was so far better than Chinese standards that the tendency of its teaching must be for them in the right direction.

I arrived at Tientsin with the 14th Infantry from Manila on July 26th, as Chief Ordnance Officer of the expedition on the staff of General Chaffee. I was much of the time near the American commander and available for general staff purposes; and he honored me by making such use of my services. In this manner I had good opportunity for general observation. Like all officers, I was intensely interested in the showing made by the different forces; and, in the comparison, I found cause, as an American officer, for both congratulation and dissatisfaction. Removal of the reasons for dissatisfaction is not apt to result from much of the criticism which has been printed; it has been apparent to the critics that something has been wrong, and, in casting about for underlying causes, they have been misled by too ready acceptance as facts of unverified rumors, and in some cases of mere guesses. The harshest critics have been those organs of public opinion which, in their disapproval and discouragement of the whole military institution, have contributed most to the unsatisfactory conditions of which they wrongly appreciate the manifestations. The inadequate though perhaps wearisome detail of the preceding pages can be summarized as follows: In the character of their material, animate and inanimate, the troops of the United States excelled; in all the results of liberal organization, training and stimulus, the product of national interest in and fostering encouragement of the military arm, they were outclassed by the forces of the other nations.

WILLIAM CROZIER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LEGAL SAFEGUARDS OF SANITY AND THE PROTECTION OF THE INSANE.

BY ALLAN M'LANE HAMILTON, M. D., F. R. S. E.

Of all the new problems which press for legislation, none is more imperative than that relating to the care and cure of the insane. Uniformity of divorce laws throughout the States of the Union will in time be secured by intelligent public opinion, and the segregation and treatment of sufferers from phthisis will also be found necessary. No less imperative should be the demand for a uniform and enlightened code of laws directed to the prevention of that form of disease which we know as insanity; to the protection of those supposed to be affected by it until a proper tribunal shall have passed upon their condition, and to the management of sufferers thus affected, looking to their prompt discharge, when the result has been a cure or a sufficient amelioration to warrant freedom.

From an economic point of view the subject is grave. The care of its insane costs the State of New York annually more than five million dollars, and every year the number of patients grows larger. A proportionate increase is found, as well, in all the great centres of population. The growing competition under which the struggle for existence is carried on, the attendant temptations to dissipation and crime, the daily stress of life, all tend to promote mental disease.

The semi-sane and the insane tread upon each other's heels. In a population of seven millions, the State of New York, on any given day in the year 1899, had about 23,000 insane persons under its care, in public and private institutions. The property devoted to their use was valued at twenty-six million dollars. In the hospitals of the rest of the Union, there are probably more than two hundred thousand of the recognized insane in institutions whose value cannot be far from two hundred million dollars.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The horrors which Charles Reade described as existing in the private asylums of Great Britain need no longer be feared, although the recently exposed inhumanity in the treatment of the supposed insane in New York City would indicate that the day of brutality and incompetence is not quite past. The prison which was converted into an asylum has now become a hospital; the significance of the change is more than verbal. The shocking conditions under which the pauper insane were chained up like wild beasts, or confined in barred pens, in some of the poor-houses of twenty years ago, have been done away with in the main. The progress of reform has been steady. The insane are no longer quasi-criminals, and the evidence that our friends and neighbors are not in mental health is no longer presented in proceedings savoring of prosecution, but rather of protection.

But other reforms are vital and necessary for the benefit of the public, as well as of the individual; and I may with propriety refer in support of this statement to the proceedings in the Wendell case, with which I had the opportunity to become personally familiar. There came here very near being a substantial defeat of justice, for the lack of just such reforms in medico-legal procedure as those I am about to advocate. Similar cases occur from time to time throughout the country. The king, as *parens patriae,* had by common law the right to take charge, through his chancellor, of the person and property of lunatics. Courts of equity in the United States have a like power.

It is for the best interests of all concerned that the body politic should, in all cases, be charged with this responsibility. In New York State, and in the country in general, the insane, whether in public or private hospitals, are wards of the State. They are all entitled to the visitation, attention and intelligent interest of the State authorities. If their estates are unable to pay, they are cared for by the State without charge. They are to a degree distributed in hospitals or farms, where they receive proper care for their particular form of disease. This is a long step in advance. But even more radical reforms are as greatly needed in the medico-legal methods by which the citizens of most if not all the States are examined as to their sanity, and committed as insane, and discharged when restored to mental health.

It has been said that "the lunacy laws of the United States are, for the most part, an incongruous mass of legal verbiage."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As a matter of fact, there is no uniform law throughout the Union on this subject, any more than there is on divorce. The reasons why there should be uniformity are apparent. The Legislatures of such States as Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, New York, Iowa and Wisconsin have given increasing attention to the laws affecting the insane, and the tendency toward wiser and more humane legislation is general.

But as medical science has still a great deal to learn about this, the most subtle and difficult of all diseases, so has medico-legal science a task, which need no longer be delayed, in the simplification of the procedure for the commitment of the insane and the discharge of the sane. If the insanity of one New Yorker in every three hundred has been passed upon by the authorities, the mental affliction of others is sometimes suspected even by the non-expert. Certain disorderly persons who in public places make themselves offensive in a way difficult to reconcile with common sense; cranks who annoy strangers; unreasonable and unpractical reformers; confirmed litigants for litigation's sake, and, in many cases, even the blackmailer may be considered in this category. So also the victims of distracted homes, of overcrowded tenements, of noisome workrooms, of vice and dissipation, of conditions of civilization with which they are unable or unwilling to cope successfully, are a menace to themselves and the community. In a majority of instances, their mental disease could be cured or prevented from reaching a dangerous development, or controlled by prompt treatment, especially by removal to a new environment. In many such cases, the probability of cure lessens rapidly as the disease progresses.

Of the insane thus at large, a majority are not proper subjects for confinement; their malady responds to treatment in their homes, or to discipline, or the influences of the changed scenes which means and leisure can procure them. But others ought to be put at once beyond the possibility of peril to themselves and others. And that involves what is known in medico-legal parlance as a "commitment."

The jurisprudence of most of the States is agreed upon the necessity for surrounding the commitment with legal safeguards; yet what has been achieved in this direction leaves much to be desired. The person and property of a citizen are held sacred by the spirit of our laws. "Too much of our legislation," says an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

authority, "seems to be based on the assumption of improper motives on the part of friends or relatives," who institute proceedings for a commitment. Impropriety of motive is rare, however.

The friend or relative who wishes to have another's sanity determined may, in the State of New York, call in any two of the physicians whose names appear on the register of the State Commission in Lunacy as qualified examiners—and of these there are about one thousand in New York City alone. These examiners must be of respectable character, graduates of an incorporated medical college, permanent residents of the State, and practitioners of medicine for not less than three years. If, on examining the patient together on the same day, they find evidences of insanity, their certificate so declaring must be signed under oath. Some judge of a court of record must then formally "approve" the medical certificate, over his own signature. The forms to be filled out for a commitment are printed by the State Commission in Lunacy, and require that certain data should be stated.

Careful provision is made by statute in most States that medical examiners shall be properly qualified for their work. The order of a court of record is required in all cases before the patient can be committed to an institution, the kind of institution depending on the ability of his friends or his estate to pay for his treatment in a private hospital, or the necessity for care and treatment at the expense of the State.

Now, an important part of this medical certificate of lunacy is a "statement of facts, to be made upon knowledge, information and belief by the examiners in lunacy," concerning the sex, age, nativity, bodily condition, habits, number of previous attacks and general symptoms upon which the conclusion of insanity is reached. Such a statement is everywhere essential. But the supposed facts it recites are in too many cases ridiculous and inadequate.

The following statements made in a few of the commitment papers which have come under my personal observation, as indications of insanity, may be cited. It need not be said that they are not necessarily indications of insanity; even if they were, no proof was adduced of the correctness of the statements, nor was any qualification made of their import:

"He has a wild look."
"She prays and is very religious."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"She sees things."
"He is very violent and does not mind what his friends say."
"He thinks people do not treat him right."
"He believes his wife is unfaithful to him."
"He is indifferent to his wife and children."
"He says his head hurts him."
"Her face is flushed."
"She thinks something has been put in her food."
"He is excited."
"He is sad and melancholy."
"He says he has lost his property and is very poor."
"I eat raw corn because clergymen eat raw corn."
"She has walked on the grass in her bare feet." (This patient was a disciple of Dr. Kneipp.)

In a recent case it was asserted by the patient that the nurses had "put needles into her feet." From reading this without any other knowledge of the case, the impression would be gained that it was an hallucination; but it turned out that the nurse had actually used the hypodermic needle by the doctor's orders.

In commitment papers, there is very rarely any statement of the patient's history, except what consists in categorical replies of the most meagre kind. Prolonged departure from the previous normal standard is seldom noted; while the clinical features of the insanity receive scant mention or none whatever. The hearsay statements of others, which the blank forms require, even if honest, are often unreliable and exaggerated. In fact, asylum superintendents very often have to make the diagnosis themselves, finding the commitment forms vague and misleading. It too often occurs that physicians indulge in generalizations; and an incompetent observer, in spite of the specific requests printed in the blank that the acts of the alleged lunatic and his exact speech should be detailed, is apt to give his own impressions.

The necessity for shutting out the hearsay evidence and for requiring accurate and proven statements of the facts on which a commitment is based, is self-evident. It goes without saying that no person should be committed to an institution for the insane upon mere recitals of acts which are common to the sane and to the insane. *Ira furor brevis est;* the recital of what a sane person often says and does under the excitement of anger would, if presented without explanation, be far more damning than the alleged indications of insanity recorded in many of the commitment papers.

The law should, therefore, exclude hearsay evidence. It

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

should require the actual legal service of the papers in all cases upon the person examined, and refuse to permit the medical examiners to be the sole judges of whether or not personal service should be dispensed with. The laws should, it seems to me, limit the number of examiners in lunacy and exact more rigid qualifications. One examiner to every 25,000 of population ought to be sufficient. At least five years of practice and some special study of mental diseases should be required; and the certificate of moral and professional qualifications should be issued in each State by some duly constituted body of the highest character, like the Board of Regents in the State of New York. In States where there is no such body, the Chief Justice of the court of last resort might act with an advisory medical board. Even after the legal certificate of two properly qualified examiners in lunacy, the judge who is asked to sign the commitment, and who can have no personal knowledge of the facts of the case, should be empowered by statute to send for the patient, if possible, and talk with him; or, still better, to send to the patient, apart from the examiners who have certified to his insanity, a medical man of high standing and special experience, who shall act as *amicus curiae* and report to the court the results of his own examination.

Proper commitment to a hospital for the insane having thus been effected, it becomes important that the right of communication between the inmate and his lawyer, friends and family in the outside world should be rigorously secured. The law prescribes that an inmate shall write at will to the authorities of the State—the Governor, the Attorney-General, the District-Attorney, the State Commissioners in Lunacy, whom he may, at any time, invoke to exercise their visitorial rights, and to the judges of the courts of record. The law in many States forbids the examination or detention of such letters by the hospital authorities, and declares that "the postage must be furnished by the institution, if relatives or friends are unable to provide the same." The law of most States makes a further provision that each patient may, once in two weeks, write other letters—to family, friends and counsel; and, in some cases, that these letters may be examined by the hospital authorities, who are authorized to use more or less discretion as to whether the letters should be forwarded to the addressees, or sent to the State Commissioners in Lunacy.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I am convinced that this discretion should be rarely exercised in the direction of secrecy, and that the safest plan on all accounts is to provide by law for free and uninspected communication between the inmate and his counsel and family. How, else, is a miscarriage of justice, such as recently occurred in a *cause célèbre,* to be rendered impossible in the future? The patient, whom I found to be quite capable of managing her affairs, and saner than many men and women now at large, although she was eccentric and at times had been excitable, was not even allowed by the physician in charge, who assumed the right of her custody, to communicate her situation to her own lawyers, and it was only an order of court that opened the prison doors. This young man had constituted himself gaoler and had surrounded the house with an armed guard.

While all private asylums should be licensed by the authorities of the State, some of the smaller institutions of this description might well be dispensed with entirely. In some private institutions, conducted by unscrupulous persons on an extravagant basis for the care of the very rich, the temptation to keep a profitable patient, after he is able to take care of himself, and is no longer insane, is undoubtedly great. Any institution conducted on a speculative plan, with the connivance of public officials, should be abolished.

The whole subject of the discharge of cured inmates—inmates who would be better off, and happier, in the outside world, useful in many ways to themselves and others—and of persons who should never have been committed, demands the most serious attention. The laws in all the States provide that a writ of *Habeas Corpus* may be applied for in behalf of any inmate in a public or private hospital for the insane, and that upon the hearing of such writ certain judicial proceedings shall be taken to determine whether or not there should be a discharge. They should also provide that any physician of a charitable public institution is absolutely forbidden to accept fees in any case.

Whenever the question of sanity is raised, I cannot too strongly state my belief, based on thirty years' experience, that no jury of laymen is fully competent to, or should be asked to, pass upon the issue of sanity. A single medico-legal commissioner, to hear and determine the facts, to advise the court and examine witnesses as to fact, as well as medical witnesses, would be pref-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

erable to the present system, or to any system other than a jury of physicians, which might prove impracticable. Sheriffs' juries should never be asked to do more than pass upon the estates of the alleged lunatics, inasmuch as they are incapable of estimating the significance of symptoms.

The laws in general, however, continue to provide that, when an inmate wishes to leave a hospital for the insane, and there is a question whether he is able to do so, the issue shall be determined by a commission and a sheriff's jury. The commission—which in New York consists of a lawyer, a doctor and a layman—acts in the rôle of judge. Evidence is offered, under oath, by both doctors and laymen, before the jury, which renders a verdict as to whether the inmate in question is sane or insane. This verdict is subject to be set aside, like any other.

In a recent case, which emphasized my conviction of the urgent necessity for legal reform in lunacy procedure, the medical member of the commission practically testified as a rebutting expert before the very jury that looked up to him as judge. In effect, he "summed up" the case to the jury, from the bench, ingeniously making a picture of symptoms of the alleged disease to fit the case. The impropriety of such action is greater where such an expert-commissioner has already passed an official judgment upon the alleged lunatic.

The propriety of a law forbidding the service on any such commission of any medical man who has ever been called into the case of the patient in question needs no argument. Nor should any State Commissioner in Lunacy—whose office gives him more or less authority over all inmates of hospitals for the insane—be allowed to appear on the witness stand as a medical expert, in any proceeding for the discharge or detention of such an inmate. The fact that the State Commissioner in Lunacy has, in his private capacity as a doctor, previously examined a patient, should also be held to preclude his sitting on the commission, or testifying in that patient's case. It can readily be seen that a prejudiced man, or one jealous of his professional reputation, might suffer a warping of conscience which would render him liable to a dangerous bias.

The general belief that the insane are ill-treated in asylums has passed away, in the main, with the conditions which gave rise to it. Wanton cruelty rarely occurs in the United States, except

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in badly managed places which are corrupt parts of a political machine. Where maltreatment exists, it is in general due to the fact that inexperienced men do not comprehend that the irritating violence of the patient is the result of disease. The sooner attendants and nurses cease to assign sane motives for disorderly conduct of the insane, and make this allowance for their charges, the sooner will retaliation cease.

Great care is given to individual cases. The advantages of foreign research and of opportunities for personal study constantly increase the usefulness of the medical staff of hospitals for the insane. While patients are sometimes retained longer than they need be, the controlling motive is often fear that they may harm themselves or others, or a desire to keep them away from the surroundings which caused their insanity. On the other hand, patients are sometimes discharged from the State hospitals before they ought to be, to make room for new patients. This overcrowding is, at times, a painful feature of State hospitals; it suggests the need of even greater State expenditures for buildings, pavilions and farms such as that at Islip, L. I. It is directly responsible for such escapes as that of seven insane criminals from Matteawan, several months ago, despite the watchfulness of an uncommonly competent medical superintendent.

It is difficult to emancipate the management of the insane asylum from politics, although this evil is not so dangerous as it once was, particularly in the State institutions. It is to be regretted that the insane, especially those with means, who are found in the hotels or streets and who are arrested and taken to committing depots, should be often obliged to pay large sums of money for commitment, and that they are occasionally obliged to undergo subsequent unnecessary legal proceedings. At several important centres of population, a small coterie of individuals has been recently known, where money was in sight, to act alternately as committing physicians, witnesses and commissioners. A more dangerous abuse it would be difficult to imagine. It is, indeed, the earnest hope of those who are most familiar with this subject that a reorganization of laws may result in profound and lasting improvements.

ALLAN MCLANE HAMILTON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CAUSES OF THE CONSERVATISM OF ENGLAND.

BY AUGUSTINE BIRRELL, Q. C., M. P., AUTHOR OF "*OBITER DICTA*," "MEN, WOMEN AND BOOKS," ETC.

If mistiness were really the mother of wisdom, then, indeed, would the Duke of Argyll be the wisest of living peers. But Cardinal Newman, it is to be feared, was writing ironically when he professed to discover so close a relationship between mistiness and wisdom; and, any way, it would be rash to assume that the Duke of Argyll is wise merely because his meaning in his contribution to the January number of the North American Review is obscure. To what cause, one wonders, is this obscurity due? More than one reason for it might be assigned. But my own belief is that the Duke's obscurity and dark sayings are largely due to the fact that, for some reason or another, he does not speak out his whole mind. He keeps back so much that what he puts forward is hardly intelligible to the plain man, who once rode upon the top of a "bus," but who now, owing to the cost of the War with the South African republics, has dismounted from his cheap conveyance and become "the man in the street."

The Duke looks about him and discovers that there is to-day a Government not only in office but in power, a Government formed "not on a conjectural platform, but one of tried and substantial planks. Never before has a majority of 150 in the House of Commons followed the Government whip's requests for five years. Never before has that majority on an appeal to the polls been sent back with power and purpose undiminished." It is, perhaps, a little early to assume, either that the reconstructed Cabinet is as powerful and as much respected in the country as was the old one, though the possibility of this may easily be admitted; or that the new majority of 134 will "follow the Government whip's requests" as obediently as did the old majority of 150. But how-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ever this may be, about the facts there can be no doubt. There Lord Salisbury is, and there he has been since 1895. How came he there? This is the question the Duke sets himself to answer, and he answers it in a breath. It is because of Mr. Gladstone's attitude in 1886 toward Home Rule for Ireland. Whatever else the Duke leaves in cloudland, this much stands out bold and clear.

> "It is necessary to go back fifteen years to know how and why it is that a Government formed not on a conjectural platform, but one of tried and substantial planks, is in office. * * * * It was impossible even for the most casual and careless to forget that these men had only been Liberal in the direction of constituting Ireland a separate nationality at the end of lifetimes devoted to combating the Nationalist Irish claim. It was seen at once that the act was done for continued power. * * * * It made England think that the party which could so surrender their convictions could not govern. And it is to this idea that the strength of the Conservatives is due."

This idea or notion of the causation of the Conservatism of England finds great favor with the "small, transfigured band" of Liberal Unionists, who have unhesitatingly attributed the longevity of Conservative governments to themselves and to the continued dread of the English electorate of Home Rule for Ireland.

I do not believe anything of the kind.

The Toryfication, if I may be allowed the word, and it is a convenient one, of London and of so many of our great towns in the north of England, and in other parts as well, is one of the most striking political facts of recent times. I have watched the process in more places than one. It began long before 1886.

Fair Trade, and all the fallacies and prejudices, deep-rooted in human nature, that to Fair Trade do properly appertain, had an immense deal to do with this Toryfication.

The hearty dislike entertained by the working man (which by a strong effort of the imagination I can account for, though I would not seek to justify it) for the wealthy, middle-class, Dissenting manufacturer, who had come to look upon the parliamentary representation of the town where he had made his money as something peculiarly his own, the devoted and self-sacrificing labors in the midst of the poorest parts of our huge populations which now characterize the clergy of the Established Church—sometimes contrasted a little unkindly with the non-parochial activities of the Nonconformist ministry—alike contributed to swell the rising tide of the new Toryism in our large towns.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

About the same time, and at the very end of the life of the strange Being who had become the Earl of Beaconsfield, sprang up the great Disraelian Myth, which has changed the most un-English of all our Prime Ministers into an almost sacramental Symbol of Patriotism, and of a species of idealism which, though vulgar enough, is yet found more exhilarating than the pure worship of Cheap Goods and Free Markets. The Disraelian Myth has been worth many a legion to Lord Salisbury. The Primrose League is ridiculous enough; but men who want big majorities must not scorn the simply ridiculous. Nor do they.

Tories after the fashion of Sir Edward Clarke are Dizzy's men, and Dizzy's men are to be found in every street of every town in the north of England; and they make more converts to what they call Toryism in a week than all the Liberal Unionists put together can muster in a twelvemonth.

To fan this flame, to make it roar and crackle like fire in a forest, came Majuba. It is no part of my present business to discuss Majuba. Personally, I do not believe in great nations pursuing unusual courses. It is not usual for a great nation, any more than it is for a high-spirited man, when slapped in the face to sit down under it. That is not the way people behave in, let me say, Sheffield. It puzzled everybody, and what puzzles everybody can hardly fail to be misunderstood. The Boers did not understand us. We were magnanimous, and they thought we were afraid. We wanted to save lives and to inspire friendship, and in fact we bred contempt, and only postponed to a distant day a far more dreadful punishment. Mr. Chamberlain, who is an idealist in the disguise of a man of business, was in 1881 all for magnanimity. Mr. Gladstone agreed with him; so did the Duke of Devonshire and the others. Mr. Chamberlain and the Duke are said to have repented. A truly repentant politician would be a novelty. Politicians rarely repent, though not infrequently they have recanted. But seldom before has it happened to men to be carried aloft on the shoulders of a mob which, as it carries them, curses their criminal folly.

Majuba Hill made Tories in streetfuls, and it certainly seemed as if nothing so Toryfying could ever happen again; when, lo and behold! the same set of men who left Majuba unavenged allowed Gordon to die the death in Khartoum. So, at least, men said, and the saying completed the conversion of many thousand

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

waverers, particularly in large towns where men, women and children are closely packed together, and where strong emotions are "in widest commonalty spread."

I will not pretend to be the happy man who knows the reason of things, but I do not hesitate to ascribe the growth of Toryism in London, and in the great towns of the north of England, mainly to the causes I have assigned. Other causes there doubtless were; indeed, I could name some of them, but among the causes those I have mentioned stand out in strong relief.

On the top of all these things came Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule schemes, which Scotland and Wales accepted, but which England failed to appreciate. Mr. Spurgeon shook his head, and Mr. Spurgeon controlled as many votes as Mr. Chamberlain. The Wesleyans could not see their way to become Home Rulers after the desired pattern; and, generally, the great Protestant interest began to scent Home Rule. It is quite true that Mr. Gladstone's Bills were never popular in England, but to suggest that their unpopularity, great as it was, manufactured Tories after the same fashion and at the same rate as they were being manufactured by Fair Trade, by the Disraelian Myth, by Majuba, by the death of Gordon—is, I think, grossly to exaggerate.

The English elector has a true political instinct bred in him by his admirable common law, and grasps, at least as well as the majority of so-called statesmen, the realities and necessities of a political situation. Is the retention of Ireland compatible with free institutions? That was in 1886, and is now in 1901, the question. It so happened that Mr. Gladstone was a fervent lover of free institutions, and the bare idea of suppressing or curtailing free institutions in Ireland was repulsive to him. I remember once making bold enough to remonstrate with him for not taking what I considered to be the proper amount of interest in Oliver Cromwell's christening robes, which were duly extended before him at Chequers Court. "I cannot bring myself," said he, "to care about Oliver; he was no lover of free institutions." "But, at least," so I ventured to murmur, gazing at the christening robes, "*you* cannot deny he was a Christian." "I see no occasion," replied Mr. Gladstone, with one of his grimmest looks, "either to deny or to affirm your proposition."

If then, we take free institutions for granted, what was to be done? Then there was something else for which Mr. Gladstone

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had an enormous respect—the something he called "constitutional methods." The spectacle of eighty members of Parliament, elected according to the rites of the polling booth, all united in a demand for a reconsideration of the Act of Union, and going with unfaltering regularity into the same lobby, was in Mr. Gladstone's eyes one of great significance.

Such a situation had to be faced and dealt with in one way or another. Mr. Gladstone was not alone in his dealings with Mr. Parnell. It was no secret that Mr. Chamberlain had opened negotiations, and who could guess what Lord Randolph Churchill might not do?

Mr. Chamberlain's scheme was never put into a bill; so no one can say whether or not it was better conceived and more likely to recommend itself to England than Mr. Gladstone's unlucky efforts; but a scheme Mr. Chamberlain had. Mr. Parnell had to choose between the two men, and he chose Mr. Gladstone.

All this chaffering and negotiating made it plain to the plainest that Home Rule was a disputatious matter, something to bargain about; and, having taken part in every General Election since and including 1885, I can only repeat that I think the Duke of Argyll is greatly mistaken in attributing Lord Salisbury's long reign to the supposed dread of Irish Nationalism. Liberal Unionism is not, indeed, to be minimized. Mr. Chamberlain, despite his vulnerability owing to his truly astounding past, is an immense force in the country, as well as an acute Parliamentarian; and the Duke of Devonshire is the most useful of men, not for anything that he says or does, but for the soundness of his looks and the sanity of his manners. But, as a whole, the Liberal Unionists have been overpraised and overpaid.

Nor has anything that has happened since the failure of Mr. Gladstone's last Irish bill, tended to elevate opposition to Home Rule for Ireland into a loftier air, to endow it with the dignity of wise statesmanship, or to paint it with the colors of true patriotism. What has Lord Salisbury done to banish the bugbear, to lay the ghost, of Home Rule? The Duke of Argyll gloats over the Tory majorities. Never before, says he, have such things happened in England. What has happened?

Has Irish loyalty received its exceeding great reward? Are the Irish landlords, that faithful bodyguard of English ascendency, hoarse with cheering? Does Local Government, that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mighty engine of power, remain in the well-tried, and, to do them bare justice, capable and economic hands of the Magistrates at Quarter Sessions? Was it not the Duke of Devonshire who declared that to entrust Local Government in Ireland to the Nationalists would be an act of madness only equal to the grant of Home Rule? And did not Lord Salisbury ratify and confirm this dictum, and adopt it as his own? What, I repeat, has happened? Lord Salisbury and the Duke of Devonshire have handed over Local Government in Ireland to the Nationalist Party, who are working the machine with unflagging energy and no mean skill to serve the ends of Irish patriotism; and though it is true that the landlords were bought off for a big sum of money, this in no way impairs the Nationalist victory, though it may rob the landlords of whatever self-respect might still be found adhering to them. How does the Land Question stand? Does the defection of Mr. T. W. Russell mean nothing, nor the fact that, with the doubtful exception of Colonel Sanderson, there is no Unionist Member from Ulster in the present Parliament who is not committed to some scheme of buying out all that is left of the landlords, and of breaking up the large grazing farms?

One fact is apparent to all the world. Lord Salisbury's counter-proposals to Mr. Gladstone's have ended in a failure that is utter and complete. The depopulation of Ireland and the final eviction of the landlords may indeed make the granting of Home Rule some time or another easy and unimportant; but this much at least is plain, that neither Tories nor Liberal Unionists have exhibited courage or understanding in their handling of Ireland since 1886. The country knows this perfectly well, and is not in the least disposed to give either Lord Salisbury or Mr. Chamberlain any credit for statesmanship in their conduct of the affairs of Ireland. They may write "Majuba" upon their banners; they may encircle the name of Gordon with a bloodstained wreath; they may invoke the mysterious shade of Mr. Disraeli, and deck themselves out with the cheap symbols of the Primrose League; they may play with Fair Trade and hint at hostile tariffs; they may make stage-love to the Colonies, and talk vaguely about an approaching Union of the Anglo-Saxon Races—all these things they may do, with some show of reason and with the certainty of winning votes; but the arms of Ireland they will never quarter. They have settled nothing, and the question still remains: Is the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

retention of Ireland compatible with free institutions? The Duke of Argyll apparently thinks not; for, though he does not speak out upon the point, he would seem to be in favor of repealing the Act of Union to the extent of cutting down the number of Irish representatives to at least one-half of their present number. But he doubts whether Lord Salisbury, for all his magnificent majority, will attempt anything of the kind. "What patience," says the Duke, "on the part of the Unionists!" Mr. Gladstone's failure to answer the Irish Question was at least magnificent; Lord Salisbury's failure is contemptible.

The Duke of Argyll's fierce determination to see all things in Home Rule is amusingly illustrated by his ability to explain Lord Salisbury's victory last October by a reference to words used by Mr. Gladstone in 1886, and without any necessity of mentioning the War in South Africa, then being furiously waged, or of alluding to the fact that the dissolution was dexterously and dishonorably chosen at a time when it was difficult to vote for the Liberal candidate without seeming to do the Boers a good turn. Mr. Chamberlain, who is a better electioneerer than the Duke, did not in his telegraphic messages trouble about 1886; he was content to tell the electors that every vote given to a Liberal was a vote gained by the Boers. Mr. Balfour, who was specially retained to lend to this method of warfare the dignity of his character, did so by explaining that Mr. Chamberlain did not mean that the Liberal candidate wished the Boers to destroy the army of Lord Roberts, but only that the Boers would in their great ignorance misinterpret the issue and be misled by the result, if any but the Tory were returned.

An excellent reason, some may think, for not choosing so delirious a moment for a General Election.

Everybody but the Duke of Argyll knows perfectly well that, but for the War in South Africa, Lord Salisbury would have had a hard tussle, and easily might have been defeated; and that even in the face of the War he might, but for the distracted counsels and divided opinions of the Opposition, have been defeated, and if so it would have been in consequence of the disgust and apathy of thousands of his usual supporters.

It is all the odder the Duke's not seeing this; for, the moment he leaves off counting Lord Salisbury's majority, which he never does quite correctly, and gets away from his causation, he reveals

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

himself in the familiar outlines of a half-hearted and suspicious supporter. There is no enthusiasm about him. He is far too honest to profess a confidence he does not feel. He marvels at the lack of courage and initiative displayed by the master of many legions. What is the good of a great army, if it goes nowhere, does nothing, and only marks time? Indeed, when the army does move, is it in the right direction? The winter of the Duke's discontent is made manifest by numerous observations. Lord Salisbury "shuns to propose anything which may be called, however remotely, by the name of conscription." Things are what they are, and a man is either a conscript or he is not. About compulsion there can be no doubt. Rifle Clubs and cheap ranges, the patronage of the great and the subscriptions of the rich, the support of a patriotic press and the turgid eloquence of the pulpit, may make shooting at a target as popular for a time with working people as golf is at present with the well-to-do; but nobody could call this avocation, "however remotely, by the name of conscription." Lord Salisbury will continue to shun compulsory service in the army for a very good reason—because nobody can tell him whether he could carry it or not. The Duke is made melancholy by this timidity, and holds out to the Ministers who have the courage to grapple with this question the high reward of being called, with both originality and point, *"Non Angli sed Angeli."* Fallen Angels, I fear, they would be before they had seen the measure through. Besides, does it not savor of Little Englandism to suggest, even through the medium of a familiar quotation, that it is better to be an Angel than an Anglo-Saxon?

Another sore point with the Duke is that Sir Michael Hicks-Beach has *as yet* done nothing to repeal the Finance Act of Sir William Harcourt. I find something almost intolerably pathetic in this "as yet." Perhaps there is still time. Even next session he might do it. The occasion is so auspicious, and the necessities of the landed interest so obvious. What a delusion is this to get hold of a man! The horrors of war are still upon us; the enemy remains in armed possession of the country our "forward-reaching" thoughts had already allowed us to allot to our soldiers; a new debt of well-nigh two hundred millions of sterling pounds hangs round our necks; the prospective expenditure upon our army and navy beggars the imagination; fresh taxes must be invented, or old ones reimposed; the very food of the people can

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hardly hope to escape the imposts of a Chancellor of the Exchequer who would gladly have resigned had he been allowed to do so; and yet, in the face of it all, here is a live lord who thinks he will wring our heartstrings by the old, old story of "country gentlemen who cannot live in their houses or give the same employment as before," "and yet nothing of all this has been repealed by the Unionist Chancellor of the Exchequer."

Perhaps, after all, the Duke of Argyll is not under any delusion, and knows perfectly well that, as long at all events as the British Empire lasts, so long will the land of Britain pay at least as much succession duty as, after too long a period of dishonorable exemption, it was made to do, first, by Mr. Gladstone, who wrought a partial reform, and afterward by the courage of Sir William Harcourt. Whether land-owners in the Colonies will ever rush to the Duke's assistance, and clamor to share his burden with him in exchange for the privilege of seeing a handful of their best talkers sitting in the Imperial Parliament and helping to shape the foreign policy of the Empire in the remarkable way in which our own members help Lord Salisbury, I do not know. Broad acres and fine sentiments seldom have a common ownership. In the meantime, our land-owners must go on paying. After all, is it not insurance money? What does the Duke himself say? "It may be difficult to persuade the toiling masses that any insurance of the future should come out of their pockets." Difficult—but not impossible, particularly if you teach by way of example.

But the fact, I am afraid, is that the Duke, though an Imperialist of the true grain, is not yet a master of imperial finance. A great Empire abroad can only be maintained by a happy and contented people at home. The old colonizing days are over, and we have entered upon a new phase of self-conscious pride and glory. The Duke does not seem alive to this. He refers with marked disapproval to the social legislation of the day; "it is all against capital," he says, "all in favor of labor." "Only at general pensions at 65 to all men and women does the Union Government hesitate." And how long will they hesitate? Free education was, we know, the gift of a Tory Government hankering after country votes. But education is by no means the chief desire of an Englishman, though it may be his greatest want—free breakfasts, free music halls, no less than free libraries and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

free baths. Is an Imperial Race, bearing all the burden of Empire here at home, to be denied its innocent amusements? Imperial Rome never grudged her citizens *panem et circenses.* Frugality at home and Empire abroad are no better fitted to live together than broad acres and lofty sentiments. People will not pinch themselves to paint the map red; they want to pledge the Empire in an imperial pint. Great military and naval establishments promote a corresponding expenditure in every department of the public service. Peace, Retrenchment and Reform—what niggard words are these, smacking of Cobden and Bright in the days of Howard Vincent and Ashmead Bartlett! When Dr. Murray reaches these words in his great dictionary (so poorly called "The English Dictionary"), he will mark them obsolete. With Peace we have naught to do; Retrenchment, with all Europe snarling at our heels, is admittedly out of the question; and as for Reform, it must be postponed until the War Office is put right. This is no time for economy, unless it be in education. It is an age of big deficits and big ideas. We must all pay, and those who have ever so little must pay for those who have nothing.

The working classes have got to be properly housed. Lord Salisbury, who, to do him bare justice, never pretends to be a philanthropist, says so; for, otherwise, poor people will not go on voting for him in London, and then down will topple the Empire, and the map of the world will turn some other color. The keys of the Empire are kept in the miserable tenements of the poor, and on the poor man's vote depends

"the glories of our blood and state."

It is no use the Duke of Argyll quarrelling with social legislation. The poor man must be kept in good humor and good health. He must be well housed and well fed, and his children may as well be educated. The poor man has grown a little tired of typhoid and diphtheria, and he hates the thought of the workhouse as much as ever did the Fellow of a College the cure of souls in the country that awaited him in his old age; he is sick of grinding poverty and of being hustled from slum to slum. In their hearing, you extol the Empire, and they cheer you, for well do they know who did the rough work that went to its making. But you must do more than extol the Empire. You must keep up the heart and the breed of the people here at home, and to do this will make inroads in many fortunes.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A pretty girl once had the audacity to jump on Dr. Johnson's knee and begin kissing the philosopher. "Go on, my dear," said the sage, complaisantly; "you will tire of that before I do." I will lay a small wager that it is the rich man, and not the poor man, who first grows tired of this hugging of the imperial idea.

The Duke is very confident about the loyalty of the Colonies. He knows them and is entitled more than most to give evidence on their behalf. Like evidence of the immortality of the soul, one can never have too much of this sort of thing. "Wherever there is British blood, there is the ever enduring British bond." The Duke even goes so far as to say that the Colonies "are so much money at credit to be called in against a rainy day."

Nobody, however, can have met a colonist and talked to him for ten minutes, without perceiving that Colonial loyalty is British loyalty with a difference. It is a conditional loyalty, and not an inevitable one. It depends upon treatment; and, unless it receives the treatment it thinks it deserves, it is capable of being converted into a deadly and enduring hatred.

There is a chapter of Rabelais devoted to a classification of fools, and among a very long list of fools, more than two hundred and fifty of them, may be noticed the Fool Imperial. What precisely Rabelais had in his mind when he pictured to himself an Imperial fool I do not know, but I think the description applies to a good many politicians of the present day, and particularly to those who imagine that the times are ripening for a confederation of the Anglo-Saxon Races. A Pan-Saxon Idea, to go down into the lists and strike the shields of the Pan-Slavonic Idea, which has just massacred the liberties of Finland, and of the Pan-Germanic Idea, which has swallowed so much and is now looking askance at the seaboard of Holland and her hardy race of seamen! Fee-fi-fo-fum!

I do not suggest that the Duke of Argyll shares these mad dreams, though I was startled not a little by a sentence in which he couples together "English and American institutions."

Lord Beaconsfield once recommended us all to take *"Sanitas"* as our motto. It is a very good one; but, just now, I think *"Sanity"* would be better. The two first Budgets of the Twentieth Century are more likely than anything I can think of to promote a Sound Mind in an Empty Exchequer!

AUGUSTINE BIRRELL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PRACTICAL EFFICIENCY OF THE PRESENT BANKING LAW.

BY JAMES B. FORGAN, PRESIDENT OF THE FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF CHICAGO.

In the annual report of the Comptroller of the Currency, special attention is called to three features of our national banking system, and suggestions are made as to how Congress can improve them by legislation. These are:

First: The excessive loaning of a bank's funds to its officers and directors;

Second: The limitation of individual loans to ten per cent. of the bank's capital, which, there being no special penalty provided for its infringement, has become partially inoperative;

Third: The evil effects supposed to result from what is considered the too lax provisions of the present law, in regard to the extent to which the legal reserve of one bank can safely be represented by a deposit in another bank, instead of by cash in its vaults.

In the suggestion to correct or improve the first of these features, in regard to excessive loans to officers and directors, a very proper distinction is made between loans to executive officers and those made to directors actively engaged in other lines of business. It is recommended that loans to executive officers should not be made until after they have been submitted in writing to the directors or executive committee of the bank, and approved by a majority of them—with a fine fixed for the infraction of this rule; and, in regard to loans to directors, it is recommended that the limit of credit which shall be extended to any director may be fixed by a resolution of the Board at any regular meeting—within which the executive officers in their discretion may loan to a director without other action by the Board.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If a limit of credit has not been so fixed, an application for a loan by a director must be in writing and approved by two directors. Such a loan may be made by an executive officer, but it must be brought to the attention of the Board at its next meeting —a penalty to be provided for violation of this rule.

These recommendations are features of a bill introduced at the last session of Congress by Marriott Brosius, Chairman of the Committee on "Banking and Currency," and are commended by the Comptroller. Are they practicable?

I heartily concur in any restrictions placed upon the executive officers of a bank in making loans to themselves, and I care not how strict these are made. I would even go further. I would suggest that such loans be entirely prohibited. There is an old saying that "it takes two to make a bargain," and it is a simple business proposition that an executive officer of a bank should not be allowed to act on both sides of transactions, on one side of which he represents his own personal wants and interests, and on the other officially represents the lending bank. I am, however, not equally in accord with the recommendations in regard to restrictions on loans to directors engaged in other lines of business.

The first recommendation, "that a limit of credit be fixed for any individual director by a resolution of the Board within which the executive officers may grant loans," would, in practice, lead to a result quite different from that which it is intended to accomplish. The executive officer, being relieved by the resolution of the directors from the responsibility properly devolving upon him by virtue of his executive office, would cease to give that close scrutiny to his transactions with directors which alone can save a bank from bad debts. A fixed and steady limit of credit, whether to a director or to any other customer, involves a bad principle in banking. Steady lines of credit to directors would be made easier, and, therefore, more common. They would be ratified and confirmed by the very law proposed.

If the executive head of a bank is fit for his position, it will be more difficult for any individual director to secure from him a line of credit to which he is not entitled than it would be to get it from a Board of Directors of which he himself is a member. Directors only share the responsibility of their united action. The executive officer assumes his alone, and is directly responsible for his action to the directors.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is the executive officer's duty to go carefully into the condition of the affairs of any one to whom he lends money, whether he be a director or not. It is his specialty to pass upon credits, and he learns how to say "No." To place upon the directors of a bank the whole responsibility of fixing the limit of any director's line of credit would only make it easier for individual directors to secure for themselves credit to which they are not entitled.

The further recommendation that, in "cases where a director's limit has not been fixed by resolution of the Board, he should make his application for a loan in writing, approved by two directors," is equally impracticable. It would only handicap an executive officer in performing his duty. It requires courage to decline a director when he makes a personal application unsupported by any stronger influence; it would call for heroic courage to decline a director a loan when approved by two other directors; and it goes without saying that any man of sufficient standing and respectability to be elected a bank director would find it an easy matter to persuade two of his friendly co-directors to approve his application for him. They would do so in perfect innocence, and no one could blame them. It is not their business to go into the affairs of their co-directors in the same way that an executive bank officer should. They would probably know the applicant as a good citizen, and a good fellow, but would not be likely to know enough about the details of his affairs to warrant them in recommending him for the credit he applies for. They might approve his application from the negative standpoint of not knowing any reason why he should not have it. The executive officer might, however, know some positive reason why he should not; and, as I have said, the approval of the application by two directors would only handicap him in his dealings with directors when they wanted more than they are entitled to.

Directors, when they become applicants for loans, should do so as individuals, on exactly the same footing as other customers. As a relief to the executive officer from the personal influence which an individual director may bring to bear upon him, he has always the full Board to fall back upon. The best men will, as a matter of course, be even more scrupulous as to their borrowings from a bank in which they act as directors than they would otherwise be. So far this has been my fortunate experience with the directors with whom I have been associated. There can be no

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

question that the best directors a bank can have are men actively and prominently engaged in business. This being so, there is nothing startling in the discovery that 18,534 out of a total of 28,709 directors of national banks are directly or indirectly indebted to the banks under their management. The only important questions in this connection are, how much of the bank's funds these directors have more than they are legitimately entitled to on a purely business basis, and how much more they have than would be granted to them if they were not directors. So long as human nature remains what it is, some men will take advantage of their official positions for their own aggrandizement, just as others will steal or otherwise act in bad faith. It is decidedly the exception, however, for a man to take advantage of his position to obtain a credit to which he is not entitled from a bank in which he is a director.

Bank directors will sometimes fail in business just as others do, and banks will lose by them just as they lose by others. Excessive loans will continue to be made to directors, not, however, because they are directors, but under the same old delusion under which bankers are led on to excessive loans, and ultimately to excessive losses—namely, the hazarding of more money to save a loan already in jeopardy. Excessive loans, unless they are deliberate thefts, are not made in first transactions. Bank directors as a class are among the best customers a bank has, and no urgent necessity exists for special legal discrimination against them. Some of them will turn out badly, in spite of any law that can be devised; but because the "hold-up man" goes abroad after dark to follow his nefarious occupation, it is superfluous to make a law preventing good citizens from walking on the streets after sundown. The law should be directed to the punishment of the wrong-doer, without interfering with the inherent rights of the good citizen.

The recommendation of the Comptroller for improvement in the second feature of our banking system to which he draws attention, is that after the words in Section 5200 of the Banking Act reading as follows: "Loans to any person, etc., shall at no time exceed one-tenth part of the amount of the capital stock of such association actually paid in," should be added the following: "Provided, that the restriction of this section as to the amount of total liabilities to any association of any person, or of any

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

company, corporation or firm, for money borrowed, shall not apply where a loan in excess of one-tenth part of the capital stock shall be less than two per cent. of the total assets of said bank at the time of making said loan. Said loan shall be at all times protected by collateral security equal to or greater in value than the excess in the amount of said loan over one-tenth of the capital stock."

It is always a dangerous thing to have any vital part of a law inoperative, or partially so. I have no doubt that the Comptroller finds difficulty in some cases in enforcing this law as it now exists.

In the development of our banking system, some banks with comparatively small capitals have grown to positions of commanding importance, have acquired large resources and accumulated large surpluses; and the law, as it now stands, would prevent them from making absolutely well-secured loans which their positions and resources fully entitle them to make. They should not, therefore, be held to a strict performance of this part of the law; but the fact remains that the Comptroller does hold other banks, not similarly situated, to a strict interpretation of it. It would, therefore, be well to change the law to meet the changed conditions, and I think the Comptroller's recommendation for an improvement in this feature of it is a good one.

The next feature, the Comptroller says, involves the fundamental principles of safe banking. It also forms, however, an important part of the national banking system itself. It is, in fact, one of the props on which the system, as it has been developed, leans. We must be careful how we interfere with it.

I think the Comptroller is inclined to exaggerate the evil results of the centralization of reserves in the large financial centres. The world's reserves are centralized in its principal financial centres. It dissipates the financial strength of a country to have its actual money resources scattered all over the country in small amounts. From an economic standpoint, it is one of the weaknesses of our national system that it requires a too wide distribution of our actual money reserves. The evolution now going on in the system will, if allowed to work itself out, mitigate the evil to which the Comptroller draws attention.

Bank consolidation, causing the formation of large banks in the central reserve cities, which carry large reserves available

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

when necessity calls for them, will afford strength to the system not heretofore felt. Although essential under our system, the legal reserve limit is not without its bad features. The fluctuations of the legal reserves of the associated banks of New York, watched as they are by every banker in the country, and commented upon weekly in the press dispatches, exercise entirely too much influence on the financial nerves of the country. A barometer is thus formed by which the financial weather of the country is forecast. Whenever our reserves get low, we prepare for a storm by withdrawing our balances and strengthening our cash reserves; and thus, by our own action, we increase the trouble which we should try to avert. This is an inherent weakness of our system, the ultimate remedy for which has not yet been evolved. It will, I think, come along the line of greater concentration of our cash resources, and not by their wider distribution, which will only dissipate our strength. What is wanted is cash reserves, held in the large financial centres, of sufficient magnitude to satisfy the whole country that they can get money when they need it. This, with an adequate circulating medium that will automatically expand and contract in response to the varying needs of business, will supply that confidence which every now and then under existing conditions is found to be lacking. It is largely a matter of confidence. When we know that we can get gold or legal tenders whenever we require them, we don't want them unless we actually need them; but if there is any doubt about it we want them whether we need them or not. If under our system it can be obtained, a bank currency in some degree responsive in the volume of its issue to the volume of the business done—and not, as is now the case, bearing no relation whatever to the business conditions calling for it—would be a big step toward a solution of our difficulties.

The Comptroller's recommendation is that but one-fifth instead of three-fifths of the fifteen per cent. reserve required by law of banks not reserve agents, may consist of balances due by reserve banks; and that banks in reserve cities be not allowed to continue to keep one-half of their legal reserves in the shape of balances due by their agents in central reserve cities.

On September 5th, last, the 3,304 country banks were carrying with their reserve agents $253,514,133, and the 261 banks of the twenty-seven ordinary reserve cities of the country were carry-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing with their reserve agents in central reserve cities $151,442,395. What portion of this amount, aggregating $404,956,528, these banks would have to withdraw to comply with the suggestion of the Comptroller, we cannot accurately determine; but that it would be a large portion is certain. To estimate that the half of it would be withdrawn, is to keep on the conservative side.

If the Comptroller held one of the positions now filled by some of his predecessors in office and himself became the executive officer of a central reserve city bank, I don't think he would suggest anything quite so radical. His expressed desire is to avoid the financial experiences through which this country has passed during the last few years, including the widespread withdrawal of currency through the country and the strain the reserve cities were subjected to in 1893, endangering the stability of the entire banking system. It does not seem to have occurred to him that the contraction which his suggestion involves would subject the banks to an experience precisely similar to that which they had in 1893, only, I believe, a greatly aggravated one; and thus he would bring about the very condition he desires to avoid.

It may be desirable thus periodically to have a practical test of the inherent strength of our system; but, to those whose hair grows prematurely grey in the process, it might seem an overdoing of the strenuous life to which, even under normal conditions, a banker is subjected. I hope Congress will defer action on the suggestions for another generation.

In the recent Presidential campaign, the successful manager of it, Mr. Hanna, as a plea for a continuance of the present administration, appealed to the people to "let well enough alone." As bankers and business men, our appeal to the present Congress should be the same: "Let well enough alone." Give us a chance, under existing laws, to develop our own resources.

With the unlimited resources at our command, if we are unhampered by unpropitious legislation, we cannot help going on to increased prosperity. It is impossible to legislate us rich, nor can we as a nation be legislated poor; but we may be hampered and retarded in our growth by ill-advised tinkering with existing laws that might shake the banking system of the country to its foundation.

JAMES B. FORGAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PLIGHT OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

BY PERRY BELMONT.

ALTHOUGH the Democratic vote, last November, may have been more than a hundred and thirty thousand below what it was four years ago, while the total vote was larger, yet the Democratic outcome was better, so far as votes can indicate it, than in 1872, when, on account of a previous aberration on the part of a nominating National Convention, Horace Greeley had only 43.33 per cent. of the whole vote, and Grant had 55.63 per cent. McKinley had this year probably not much over 52 per cent.

I.

In considering remedies, there may be inspiration in the results obtained, after the Greeley fiasco, by members of the Manhattan Club, including among them O'Conor, Tilden and Marble. Having reformed Tammany Hall, the Democracy carried New York State in 1874 by some fifty thousand, and in 1876 chose a majority of national electors who certified in due form that Tilden had by them been chosen to be President. If the House of Representatives had stood firmly and calmly by the constitutional process of counting, as then defined by law, Tilden might have been peacefully inaugurated, and his guidance have saved the country from the coinage and currency calamities which afterward came upon it because Democrats in Congress had been bereft by Republicans of their chosen leader in the White House.

There are members of the Manhattan Club now living who stood by the Democratic reformers of that day, and by the Democratic national platform of 1876—a platform which may fairly be taken as the best modern exposition of the Democratic prin-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ciples which should be applied at Washington—and who are now ready to contribute their ripe wisdom in the present political crisis.

II.

Without such exceptional faculties and facilities as Tilden had, it is impossible to know well the political tendencies which operate throughout an area as large as is the United States. It is possible, however, to refer intelligently to the voting, during the last decade, in one Congressional District of New York situated on Long Island and Staten Island, composed of the counties of Suffolk, Queens and Richmond, which may be taken as typical of the earliest settled communities in the northeastern part of our country. Its population is partly agricultural and partly urban, gaining a livelihood on sea and land, made up of many races and religious creeds—the western portion being adjacent to cities, while the eastern retains the traces of early New England settlers. The voters are intensely patriotic and without illusions or delusions regarding silver, or gold, or greenbacks, or legal tender contrivances to defraud creditors, and they know what is honest and straightforward in the affairs of a State or of individuals.

In the district to which I refer, there were for President Democratic majorities of 3,310 in 1880; 4,455 in 1884; 2,763 in 1888, and 4,795 in 1892; whereas there were Republican majorities of 13,948 in 1896, and 3,420 in 1900.

The cause of the change in 1896 is not far to seek. It came of suspicion that the Democratic leaders were abandoning the Democratic principles of the Tilden-Marble platform of 1876. In the last Presidential campaign, the voters reduced the Republican majority of the first McKinley campaign, in the area of the old Congressional district (notwithstanding Governor Roosevelt's residence therein) from 13,948 to 3,420, because of a feeling that the perilous clouds, which four years before seemed settling over the whole land, were passing away. There was also a belief that a majority of the Kansas City Convention wished to obliterate the undemocratic declaration of 1896, and that majority would have done so, had it not been for the surviving ambitions and the delusions of two or three men, then in the places of leaders. They clung to the dead body of the fusion of 1896, a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fusion with Populists and Silver Republicans, many of whom in the extreme West subsequently voted for McKinley, and returned, or are now returning, to the Republican party from which most of them had emerged but a few years ago.

III.

From the point of view held by the American Democracy, there are two criticisms on the conduct and leadership of those who cunningly obtained possession of the Democratic machinery in 1896, and nominally retained it in 1900. Their platform and candidate proclaimed theories which were once Republican, were then defended by Populists, but were always un-Democratic. The usurpation of the Democratic name and organization accomplished at Chicago in 1896, was as furtive as it was sudden in execution. It took the Democracy unawares. It was not "openly proposed and fairly presented" in the several States, as Mr. Bryan has recently said a party revolution should be.

The aberration from the immutable principles of the American Democracy did not proceed from within, or from those whom ex-President Cleveland has recently described as "the rank and file." It was the result of an intrigue between a few leaders controlling the organization in certain States and dissatisfied Republicans, uniting with Populists who made the "capture" (that is the word used by Mr. Bryan) of the Chicago Convention. Neither New York nor the Eastern States were taken into the conspiracy.

Of the 741 delegates to the National Silver Party Convention, 526 had been Republicans, and the temporary chairman of the Populist National Convention declared in his speech that the Bryan Chicago Convention had been guilty of stealing "the People's Party platform almost entire."

After the campaign of 1896, Mr. Bryan published a book entitled "The First Battle," in which he set forth, with much minuteness, the several steps taken by those who had plotted against the traditional policy of the Democratic party. He disclosed motives and methods generally unknown at the time by Eastern Democrats. As a member of the House of Representatives, when President Cleveland urged the repeal of the destructive Sherman Silver Dollar law, Mr. Bryan led the resistance to the repeal, resorting finally to dilatory and obstructive tactics. After

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

those had been suppressed by a majority of the House and the repeal had been enacted, he, as he announced in his book (p. 150), went to a conference of silver men in Omaha, in June, 1894. There he proclaimed his invention of free silver coinage at "16 to 1" without waiting for the "aid or consent of any nation on earth." During the next year, and early in 1896, several other conferences, or conventions, were held in the South and West; he mentions Senators Jones and Stewart of Nevada, and other Republicans, as the "leading spirits." The avowed purpose, in the beginning, was a non-partisan movement to constrain the Republican and Democratic National Conventions to declare for free silver, and "to provide for the nomination of a silver ticket in case both failed to do so." That non-partisan scheme having encountered obstacles, another movement was begun to "capture" the Democratic Convention at Chicago. A "Bimetallic National Committee," as it called itself, was formed in a Washington hotel, Mr. Bryan says, which appointed a State Committee in each of thirty-five Southern and Western States and Territories to attend and "capture" the Chicago Convention. They met at the Sherman House in Chicago, immediately before the assembling of the Democratic Convention, and Mr. Bryan said that the silver intrigue must "secure the temporary organization and control the Convention at every step." On that silver committee, outside the Convention, was Mr. Frank Foster of Massachusetts, but neither New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, nor any New England State, excepting Massachusetts, had any part in the conspiracy against Democratic doctrines. The silver cabal won at every point. The National Democratic Committee had very properly, in recognition of his successful leadership and meritorious services, proposed Senator Hill as temporary Chairman; but, in violation of precedent and traditional courtesy, his election was resisted and defeated. The outsiders led by Bryan accomplished the admission of contested delegates, of whom Mr. Bryan was one, who had been refused admission by the Democratic National Committee.

In this way and by other expedients, they captured two-thirds of the Convention. The captors were able to defeat the minority platform, which concisely, clearly and accurately set forth the financial and currency measures which the voters commended in 1896, and again last November. Meanwhile, and as recently as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

February, 1896, Mr. Bryan announced (page 124) that he "would not support for the Presidency an advocate of the gold standard," and set forth at much length the political ethics which justified him, as he says, in participating in a Democratic convention, and then "bolting" out of it when he could not succeed in discarding Democratic doctrines.

Mr. Bryan seems to imagine that Democrats are getting together to do to him and his Republican and Populistic allies what he and they did to the American Democracy in 1896. At Chicago, a few nights ago, he was reported as having said:

> "Reorganization is an internal remedy and it cannot be applied externally. Those who are within the party lines have a right to a voice in the making of the platform and are entitled to make such change in the organization, or machinery, of the party as they please, but honesty and good faith require that any desired change shall be openly proposed and fairly presented."

Those are the veriest commonplaces, the truth of which all Democrats will concede; but in 1896 the furtive conspirators did not proceed as "honesty and good faith require." The methods by which Bryan, Croker and their allies dictated at Kansas City a reaffirmation of the Chicago platform repugnant to a majority of the Convention, are well known. Mr. Bryan deems a voter not to be a Democrat unless his vote was cast for him in 1896, or 1900. How was it with those Democrats who did not vote for Breckenridge, or Douglas, in 1860, although sound Democrats before and after? How was it with those, previously Democrats, who voted against Cass in 1848, but for Pierce in 1852? Was not John Van Buren, the first President of the Manhattan Club, a Democrat, even although he did not vote for Cass? Were not those Democrats who refused to vote for Cass in 1848, among the "wheel horses" for Pierce in 1852, and were not those Democrats who could not stomach Greeley in 1872 among the most efficient for Tilden in 1876?

The American Democracy is not "cabined, cribbed, confined" by votes for Bryan or confidence only in Bryan. It is "broad and general as the casing air." Although Tilden had received the votes of a majority of the Presidential electors duly chosen and therefore was President *de jure*, he did not by speeches and through a newspaper solicit a renomination. But when, in the course of time, he indicated his preference for Cleveland, the Democracy approved his choice and the people ratified it. His

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

suggestion of Manning for Secretary of the Treasury was adopted by the President, and approved by the country. Manning, in the grasp of a mortal illness, tendering his resignation to the President, told him, with a clear perception of the Republican silver dollar peril, that "the country is plunging along a miry road to foreseen disaster," "foreseen," at least, by Manning. The disaster came.

IV.

Notwithstanding the counting out of Tilden and counting in of Hayes by the Electoral Commission, leaving the *de jure* President out of the executive office, the Democracy fairly prospered until the second term of Cleveland, when calamities—generated by Republican greenbacks to be redeemed, and Republican silver dollars whose coinage had to be stopped—burst over the country, accompanied by world-wide financial and industrial depression, followed by annual Federal deficits from 1894 to 1899 inclusive. The tariff legislation of Cleveland's second term encountered, as we can now see, difficulties and perils not then understood. Industrial depression was doing its devastating work. The deficit had to be dealt with and changed into a surplus. The wisest were at a loss to know which, among the many proposed, would be the most feasible remedy. Before the President's annual message in December, 1893, the Ways and Means Committee of the House had prepared a tariff bill which Cleveland commended to Congress. He expressed the opinion that "a small tax upon incomes derived from certain corporate investments" had been wisely embraced in the plan. That income-tax was put in the Wilson bill by Bryan and two others, who composed a sub-committee of the Ways and Means Committee. The Secretary of the Treasury took a similar view and alluded to investments of railroads as under-taxed, although the managers of such enterprises looked upon them as over-taxed, in comparison with other property. The sum required from the income-tax was not declared and apportioned among the several States, and the Supreme Court was constrained to decide it to be unconstitutional. The unprecedented obstacles arising in the Senate out of claims, rivalries, diversified and conflicting tariff interests in the enormous area of the United States, prejudiced the new law before it had taken its place on the statute book.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The remedies presented by Bryanism in 1896 when industrial depression, in the United States and in Europe, was near its end—remedies taken over by the Chicago Democratic Convention of 1896 from the Populist and Silver Republican Conventions—were so repugnant to American Democracy, that the Republican leaders were enabled to foist upon the nation an executive and a Congress, which, by the Dingley tariff, carried protective customs taxes on many articles to the highest point, as if out of mere spite against foreigners. That action started in Europe a war of retaliation against the United States, which the Republican leaders profess to be able to mitigate by reciprocity makeshifts in the form of tariff treaties.

It is impossible to think of customs taxes which will not bring in revenue, and it is also impossible to raise two hundred millions annually by a tariff, and not thereby give subsidies to domestic manufacturers of articles similar to the duty-paying foreign products. However praiseworthy may have been such subsidies for military or other purposes in the early history of the government, it is very different when the subsidies paid by customs taxes enable or compel those who obtain them to sell their surplus in foreign countries at lower prices than to our own people. The Supreme Court, when in McCullough's case it declared, by the pen of Marshall, that Congress had an implied power to create "the bank," also declared it had an implied power to "promote the common defense and general welfare" by protecting our manufactures from injurious foreign competition; but the Chicago Democratic Convention of 1892 denounced as unconstitutional a tariff for any other purpose than revenue. The Chicago platform of four years afterward affirmed "that the tariff duties should be levied for purposes of revenue" (omitting "only"), and said nothing of the unconstitutionality of protective rates and schedules. The coinage and currency question so absorbed the voters that the tariff agitation disappeared. In a recent article, however, a Secretary of the Reciprocity Commission at Washington working under the fourth and other sections of the Dingley tariff law, exposes, with a simplicity unexampled in modern partisan literature, "the feeling of exasperation and resentment throughout the commercial world" aroused by that tariff. The intention of its framers was, he said, to put rates high, "in order to permit reciprocal concessions" by the Execu-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tive. He publishes a list of reciprocity treaties which the Senate and Congress have not ratified. He then makes the prediction that, if the reciprocity contrivances should fail, retaliations against the United States, on account of the monstrous Dingley tariff, "will restrict all foreign trade, entrain endless embarrassments and engender unfriendly feeling between the nations involved." Senator Lodge was reported as arguing the other day in the Senate that there was urgency for the Army bill because Europe may threaten by force our increasing export trade. He mentioned the beginning of a European federation against it, but he did not assign as the cause the subsidies offered by the Dingley tariff, which constituted an invitation to European retaliation. The Bryan Chicago platform declared that there must not be "changes in our tariff laws," excepting to cure deficits, "until the money question is settled." Has it been settled?

Be that as it may, the tariff question will be profoundly affected by the interpretation which, in the cases pending before it, the Supreme Court shall give to the phrase of the Constitution "throughout the United States."

Since the publication of two papers on the subject in the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for December, 1899, and March, 1900, I have not seen any reason to doubt what the final judgment of the Supreme Court will be regarding the theories of the Constitution upon which the McKinley administration and the Republican Congress have based their government of our new islands since the Treaty of Peace. Those theories the Attorney-General has recently exploited before that tribunal.

A review of the political events of the century just now completed, discloses the fact that, during all the period, the American Democracy has struggled to maintain intact the partition of sovereignty between the people of the States in whom all sovereignty resides, the State governments that the people created, and the government of the United States. That government the people of the United States, acting as States, afterward established by taking from the States a portion of the sovereignty they held, and conferring it on the new government now at Washington. The Democracy has endeavored to concede to that new government at Washington all the "implied powers," fixed and required under the Constitution, by interpreting the grant of those powers not too strictly and rigorously, but fairly and justly. During

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nearly all the first sixty years of the last century, the executive department of the Federal Government was in the hands of the Democracy, inasmuch as the administrations of John Quincy Adams, Harrison and Tyler were brief episodes. The three amendments of the Constitution resulting from the war of secession have, in Democratic opinion, only diminished a few of the pre-existing powers of each of the several States, and have not in any sense modified the old Democratic rules for interpreting the grant of powers. Excepting the very few rights of sovereignty taken away by those three amendments and given to the Washington government, its limitations and State Rights exist as before. That has a distinct bearing on the future of the Democratic party, inasmuch as many of the modifications in the laws of our country demanded by Bryan and the Populists cannot be constitutionally made by Congress, but, if they are to be made at all, are for the people of the several States to consider and enact, under their reserved powers in the partition of sovereignty originally made by the people.

V.

The failure on the part of those signing the recent Spanish treaty to keep in mind those century-old tenets of the American Democracy, has precipitated upon the Supreme Court the pending questions growing out of that treaty, and has thrown into confusion and perplexity the President, the Senate, our foreign and domestic affairs. It must have been that our American negotiators at Paris considered and decided, before signing the treaty, how our new Islands were to be governed. President McKinley and the Republican leaders have since been executing the theories of that decision regarding the meaning of the phrase "throughout the United States."

There are those who say that the ratification of that treaty has, in some way, taken the United States out of what they describe as a "century of isolation," made them a "world-wide power," compelled a new kind of diplomacy, and novel participation in the affairs of other nations. But has the Federal Constitution been thereby changed? Has the Government of the United States ceased to be one whose sovereignty is limited? Have the executive and legislative powers been thereby enlarged? Those are the questions now pending before the Supreme Court.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Must not our Constitution be modified, before the President of the United States can enter into "world-wide" affairs on a par with European Kings, Queens and Emperors, who (which the United States government has not) have full sovereign powers unrestrained by a written fundamental law. Armies and navies can be moved as such sovereigns please, and treaties can be made as they have a fancy to make them, whether public or secret.

President McKinley, under the inspiration of "world-wide power," invades China, without specific authority of Congress, with an army of five or six thousand, and enters into stipulations with Europeans regarding the internal affairs of China. Some of the features of the President's pending negotiations with foreign powers at Pekin regarding future Chinese autonomy, should show whither "world-wide power" is going, and how far the McKinley Administration has departed from the traditions of the Department of State under its former chiefs. But it will be a strange commentary on "world-wide power," if it shall after all turn out that the Administration has recently had no real influence on Chinese affairs.

VI.

Is the government departing in many ways from the well considered diplomacy and negotiations, when Caleb Cushing concluded our first treaty with China, and our first treaty with Japan was made by Commodore Perry, both ratified under Democratic administrations?

And then what is to be thought of that which has recently gone on between Washington and London regarding the Isthmian canal? Did the Executive, following good American traditions in such important matters, confer with his party friends in Congress, before he made such definite pledges to England by the Hay-Pauncefote settlement? Is the whole affair to be taken as an expression of the President's conviction that, in order to be a "world-wide power," the President must have the treaty making power in his hands as European sovereigns have it? Must the Senate, representing in such matters the several States whose rights may be infringed by a treaty, accept whatever the President may choose to send to it?

The American Democracy condemns imitation in the New World of the faults of the Old, intrusion into spheres of influence abroad where it has no call to go, seeking an over-sea empire, com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mitting the war power to the Executive unless when sudden assault is to be repelled, the establishment of a great standing army forbidden by the nature and purposes of our government, hostile to the prejudices of Americans, as shown by the clause of the Constitution preventing a permanent appropriation therefor. The great material prosperity which has come, and is coming, to the United States from their independent isolation will, by the inevitable rivalries of increasing American production, trade, and the power of enormous wealth and capital, create enough resentment without our taking part in international political and dynastic ambitions in Europe. The American Democracy has in mind the wisdom of John Bright when he said:

> "There never was a time since the beginning of history when there was not one, or more than one, State which conceived itself either so numerous, or so well situated, or so rich, or so ingenious, or so united, or so martial, or so pious, or so favored by Heaven, or so pre-eminent for some other great quality, that it might safely defy all the rest of the world, set up its own rules, be its own law, and entertain schemes incompatible with the peace of the world."

The American Democracy is now confronted by two opponents hostile to one another, but each finding Democracy in its path. One is the Republican party, or a portion of it, tearing up the Constitution in pursuit of what it describes as "world-wide power." The other is the organization of the Populists, trampling under foot the Constitution, in pursuit of objects over a greater part of which Congress has no jurisdiction. If there are evils infesting our national, State and municipal affairs, such as Mr. Edmunds has recently described, and if they have largely come upon us since we departed from that independent isolation which gave the United States abounding freedom, wealth and real international power, since the wars of "aggression" by our armies have been entered upon, and since trade wars by subsidies are being waged for "world-wide power," how is Washington to be purged of those evils, unless by political purification beginning in the towns, cities and capitals of each of the several States? The constant problem to be solved, the never-ending temptation to be resisted, arises from the perpetual need of wise restraint and guidance of Federal powers exercised by the government at Washington, but amid all the perils and solicitudes of the present the Democracy does not despair of the future or of the Republic.

PERRY BELMONT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SOUTH AND THE NEGRO.

BY MARION L. DAWSON, FORMERLY JUDGE-ADVOCATE-GENERAL OF VIRGINIA.

THE social crisis through which the South is now passing is far more serious than those who are unfamiliar with Southern conditions suppose. The illustrious Henry W. Grady, whose public utterances on this subject were received in all sections with commendation and applause, once said: "The future holds a problem in solving which the South must stand alone. This problem is to carry within her body politic two separate races, nearly equal in numbers. She must carry these races in peace, for discord means ruin; she must carry them separately, for assimilation means debasement; she must carry them in equal justice, for to this she is pledged in honor and in gratitude; she must carry them even unto the end, for in human probability she will never be quit of either." This is true with one exception. The South cannot solve this problem standing alone; she must have the sympathy and support of all sections to assist her in accomplishing the great work which Providence has entrusted to her. Mr. Grady recognized this, and repeatedly emphasized it on many subsequent occasions.

The South accepted in good faith the problem which was thrust upon her, and, trusting in the guidance of God and in the justice and sympathy of a united people, she pledged her sacred honor to execute her trust faithfully. She knew that she must solve the problem by meeting, as best she could, conditions as they arose. She had no past experience to guide her, for there is no instance recorded in history where two alien and dissimilar races have ever existed side by side, on a plane of civil and political equality, for any length of time, in peace. She also knew that she must solve it so as to give the inferior race every indus-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trial and educational advantage; less than these would not satisfy the exacting demands of justice and humanity. She knew, too, that she must hold the confidence and win the gratitude of the inferior race, at the same time maintain a social barrier across which no alien foot should come, and preserve at all hazards Anglo-Saxon ascendency. No attempt should be made to disguise this fact, no excuse should be offered for it, and no deception should be practiced on the public. Deception and evasion are the resorts of the crafty and the cowardly. Honesty in this, as well as in other matters, is the best policy.

In a spirit, then, of absolute fairness, having only the best interest of our common country at heart, let us look the facts plainly in the face. All sections desire nothing more and nothing less than the whole truth; in this the South most heartily concurs. I have discussed this question with all classes of intelligent people, in nearly every State in the Union, from Virginia to California, and from Maine to Southern Texas; and, whenever I have discovered any bitterness or prejudice against the South, or any desire to condemn her because of her treatment of the negro race, I have found that it arose from a misconception of the facts.

Barring a few fanatics, whose opinions influence no one, and who persistently blind themselves to all truth, except that which they wish to find, the people everywhere are disposed to be just. To those, then, who are ready to recognize *truth* wherever found, the following facts are presented with the hope that they will conclusively show that the South has in no way failed in her duty to the negro race.

It is unnecessary to shock the sensibilities of the public by calling attention to the repulsive details of those crimes for which lynching, in some form, has been the almost invariable penalty. They have always been, however, of a nature so brutal and so savage that no pen can describe and no imagination picture them. It is only necessary to say, in this connection, that the South once more stands arraigned before the bar of public opinion, charged with brutal and inhuman treatment of this weak and inferior race, of whom she is the natural guardian and protector. Let judgment be not hastily rendered. If she deserves a verdict against her, by all means let her be condemned; but if she is innocent, let justice hasten to remedy the wrongs which in some sections have been ignorantly done her.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

All thoughtful people, who have intelligently considered this much discussed subject, must uphold the conclusion that, generally speaking, the desire on the part of a large number of citizens in any given community to take the law into their own hands, and summarily try and execute criminal offenders, must arise from one of the following causes:—1. An ignorance of the fact that the safety of society depends upon a just and orderly administration of the law, and that however righteous the cause may seem to be which, on any given occasion, influences the mob, the inevitable tendency of mob violence is to anarchy; 2. Some defect in the machinery of the law, which renders the administration of justice tedious and uncertain; 3. The ungovernable fury to which the people are aroused by the exceptionally heinous nature of the particular crime which they organize to avenge.

The first of these probable causes for mob violence may be dismissed with but few words. Lynchings have occurred in all sections of the country. The mob has been organized for its deadly work in the centres, as well as on the borders, of civilization. The lawless acts of the mob at Urbana and Akron, Ohio, Pana, Illinois, and New York will go down in the history of crime side by side with those in Texas, Georgia and New Orleans. In 1892, two hundred and forty-one lynchings were divided between twenty-seven States, scattered from Virginia to California, and from New York to Texas; in 1893, there were no less than one hundred and fifty-nine lynchings in fourteen different States; in 1894, eighteen States recorded them, and in 1897 the numbers rose to one hundred and sixty-six in twenty-five States; in 1898, the number of lynchings diminished, but in 1899, the mobs, in both the South and the middle West, surpassed in fury all past records. In the former, a negro brute, whose atrocious crime almost placed him outside the category of human beings, was horribly mangled and burned to death at the stake; in the latter, negro men and women were shot to death in a race riot caused by labor competition.

These facts prove conclusively that mob violence is not a sectional matter, nor is it the result of any desire or intention on the part of the white people of the South to oppress and ill treat the negro race. Lynchings in the South are mainly caused by the peculiar nature of the crimes for which lynching is a penalty, and partly, perhaps, by the delay and uncertainty incident to all legal

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

proceedings everywhere. I recall, in this connection, the following case which happened in Virginia some years ago. A young negro, who had been raised by a respectable farmer and treated always with kindness and consideration, abused in an unspeakable manner, and then murdered, the farmer's five-year-old child. He was apprehended and hurried secretly to a distant jail. There, cool counsels prevailed, and in due course he was tried and convicted. An appeal was taken, and, on a technicality, the Supreme Court reversed the decision of the lower court, and remanded the case for a new trial. At the second trial, he was again convicted and the case was again appealed. A year had now passed, and the patience of the people had become exhausted. They consequently took him out and hung him to the nearest convenient tree. Two other cases are also recalled, in each of which a defense of insanity was set up, the accused was ably defended, expert testimony was introduced, and, after a long delay, a bitter fight and great notoriety, they were executed in an orderly way.

The crime itself, however, is more responsible for mob violence than all other causes combined. The Anglo-Saxons have always been distinguished above other races for their passionate devotion to their homes; they have never considered life too dear a sacrifice to offer in its defense. When the intelligence, then, is flashed through a community that a home has been despoiled, that its protector has been slain, that the mother or the wife or the daughter or the idolized child—none has been spared—has been torn violently from the family circle and left worse than dead, I care not how quiet and how orderly the community may be, nor how promptly the officers of the law may act, nor what barriers they may throw around the criminal, the chances are that all will be equally helpless to protect him. The deepest passions are inflamed, the fiercest instincts of the race are aroused, reason is temporarily dethroned, law and order forgotten, mob violence runs riot and death falls upon the criminal with a power as terrible and as resistless as a thunderbolt discharged from an angry storm cloud. No right-thinking man or woman, white or black, ought to have, or can have, any sympathy for such criminals as those who suffer death for the crimes described, nor can they believe that any punishment, however cruel or severe, is undeserved. The fact, however, that the tendency of mob violence is to destroy liberty, to abolish courts and to dissolve the bonds of society,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

renders it of the utmost importance to devise the surest and most practical way to stop or at least to check it. In full realization of this, the leading citizens of the South have conscientiously devoted their best talents to that end.

One practical way in which the evil may be remedied will be to make such changes in the penal laws as will insure a certain and speedy administration of justice, and do away with the harassing and painful necessity of a rigid cross examination of the victims, either in open court or behind closed doors. It is of the utmost importance, too, to make the lawless element among the negroes clearly understand that crime will be surely and speedily punished, and the better class of their own race should lose no opportunity to denounce negro criminals, and they should do all in their power to assist in bringing the guilty to justice. If this is consistently done, it will unquestionably tend to check crime; but, as it will not go to the root of the matter, it will not effectually prevent it. This can only be accomplished by elevating the moral and intellectual condition of the young, ignorant and shiftless element of the negro race. It is a well known fact that from this element come nearly all negro criminals.

History teaches us that education, in its most comprehensive sense, is the only known means by which the desired results can be obtained. Freedom without intelligence and without virtue is a dangerous possession, because without these liberty is too often synonymous with license. The South has gone to the limit of her resources to confer this priceless gift upon the negro race. She now expends about forty millions of dollars annually in school funds, of which sum the negroes contribute but one-thirtieth, though they have the opportunity to reap nearly half the benefit. In the South, all trades are open to them, and they receive every encouragement to become proficient in the industrial arts. A large number of negroes have eagerly taken advantage of these opportunities and have made unprecedented progress in bettering their condition in every way. They have amassed in one State property, the assessed value of which is nearly thirty millions of dollars, and it is estimated that they own, all told, about three hundred millions of dollars' worth of personal and real estate. They have their own doctors, lawyers, and preachers; they have been given the best schools, colleges, and universities, and they have their own military companies. Many

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of them realize that their interests are inseparable from the interests of the South. They have found by experience that the people who give them employment, who annually pay millions of dollars that their children may be educated, who make it possible for them to acquire wealth, who labor side by side with them in the field and in the factory, are their best friends. The criminals, as a rule, do not come from this class, but from that far larger class who have failed, or refused, to take advantage of their opportunities, and who seem to have little or no moral conception of crime. It is this class who constantly menace isolated Southern homes with a danger worse than death, that threaten to depopulate rural districts and paralyze agriculture. It is this class who have no regard for human life and who seem to revel in crime. These are they who terrorize the defenseless of both races, who encourage criminals, secrete them and assist them to escape, who make martyrs of them when they are captured, and who kill the fatted calf and receive them with open arms when they return from penal servitude.

Criminal statistics show that while only twelve per cent. of the population of the United States are negroes, this race furnishes thirty per cent. of the criminals and twenty-eight per cent. of the murderers, including all races.

But, even with these facts before us, and dark as the picture may seem to be, and heavy as the burden which the South must yet bear, she not only is not without hope, but she has unwavering confidence in the future. Education and civilizing influences must ultimately win the victory over ignorance and vice; if they do not, education is a failure and the history of civilization a lie. These influences will lessen crime, and the law-making power, encouraged by public opinion, which after all is the dominant power in a free government, and of which Legislatures are but the reflectors, will devise some swift and adequate punishment for it.

The South will solve her problem. She will work out her own salvation; and in this great labor for humanity she will have, and she will deserve, the encouragement, the sympathy and the support of this now united people, who are striving only for the best interests of a common country.

MARION L. DAWSON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"SUBSTITUTES FOR SHIP SUBSIDIES": A REPLY.

BY ALEXANDER R. SMITH.

It is a somewhat significant commentary on the paucity of argument against government aid for American merchant ships in the foreign trade, that recourse is had so often to the statistics of our domestic shipping to prove an increase in "our maritime efficiency." In advocating small bounties on cargoes carried from the United States, as "Substitutes for Ship Subsidies," in the January number of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, Mr. Louis Windmüller falls into this error. It should be clearly understood that subsidies are not asked for vessels in our domestic trade, but only for our shipping in the foreign trade. Our domestic shipping, which is protected by our laws against the competition of foreign shipping, is in a state of healthy, prosperous and profitable growth. The reverse is true of our unprotected shipping in the foreign trade. And it is because of this fact that subsidies and bounties are asked for the latter.

Mr. Windmüller, in my judgment, would have come much nearer to a correct statement of the condition he wished to describe, had he submitted such a table as the following in place of the one he used in his article:

AMERICAN TONNAGE IN FOREIGN TRADE IN 1890 AND 1899 COMPARED.

Year.	Total Tonnage.	Sail.	Steam.
1890	946,695	749,065	197,630
1899	848,246	488,216	360,030

Here is shown an actual decline of over ten per cent. in our tonnage under register (in the foreign trade) in ten years. But it would be scarcely fair to assert that there had been an actual decline in the "efficiency" of our tonnage, as it is estimated that a ton of steam shipping is equal to three tons of sail shipping. On this basis, therefore, Mr. Windmüller might contend that the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

following would be a fairer statement of the efficiency of our shipping under register:

EFFICIENCY OF AMERICAN SHIPPING UNDER REGISTER IN 1890 AS COMPARED WITH 1899:

Year.	Total Tonnage Efficiency.
1890	1,341,955
1899	1,568,306

This would show a growth in the efficiency of our marine in the foreign trade of over seventeen per cent. But, to be just, Mr. Windmüller would have been compelled to admit that it is our steam shipping that has been aided, during the larger part of the decade named, in which the growth has occurred, and that the decline has been in our sail tonnage, which has received no aid whatever during that time. There are no regularly established lines of steamships under our flag in the foreign trade that do not receive direct aid from our Government, and as to steamships which do not receive aid, it will be found, upon examination of the official records, that they are, generally speaking, engaged as much in the domestic as in the foreign trade. In other words, it is fair to assume that, but for the aid given by the enactment of our postal subsidy law of 1891, crippled as it was, there would have been no substantial growth in our steam shipping in the foreign trade between 1890 and 1899. In this very connection, the statistics of our steam tonnage under register from the close of the Civil War up to and including 1891, when the postal subsidy act was passed, fully bears out the claim that, but for this aid, our steam shipping under register would have shown no substantial growth in the last decade. As the war ceased only three months before the close of the fiscal year of 1865, the figures of the steam tonnage for that year are misleading, because they were abnormally low, being but 98,008 tons. In 1866, the steam tonnage under our register amounted to 198,289, while in 1890—twenty-four years later—it was but 197,630 tons, showing a slight decline. It should be said, however, that, between those years, our steam tonnage under register had (in 1868) increased to 221,939 tons, the highest amount, and had declined (in 1880) to 146,604, the lowest amount. The annual average of steam tonnage under American register during the entire twenty-six years succeeding 1865, was 186,182. It will be observed that from the time of our Civil War until 1891, the growth of our steam ton-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nage under register was practically nil. Using Mr. Windmüller's own citation of the subsidy paid to the Pacific Mail Steamship Company, between 1865 and 1876, it is pertinent to show that during that entire period, excepting 1865, our steam tonnage under register never fell below 177,666 tons, and was as high during one year as 221,939, which latter figure was not again reached until 1891. It is also pertinent to point out that our tonnage under register fell, in 1878, to 170,838, and in 1880 to 146,604, the latter marking the lowest tonnage in any year succeeding 1865, and to add that it is by no means improbable that this decline was due to the withdrawal of the subsidies in 1876.

Even going back to 1850, and citing the case of the Collins Line, referred to by Mr. Windmüller, which in that year had come into full operation, we find additionally interesting data. Our first subsidy act was passed in 1845, advantage of which was taken for the first time in 1847, when but 5,631 tons of steam shipping was under American register. The next year it increased to 16,068 tons, and in 1849, the year in which the Collins ships first appeared, our steam shipping under register had increased to 20,870, more than doubling in 1850, when our steam tonnage under register amounted to 44,942—a growth of over 800 per cent. in three years. It still further increased until 1855, when it reached 115,045 tons, but again declined, probably largely because of the severe losses suffered by disaster to the Collins Line, falling, in 1858, to 78,027 tons. This was the year in which the Collins Line failed, and this was the year in which the United States subsidy was withdrawn from the line—at a time, by the way, when its great rival, the British Cunard Line, was receiving a subsidy from the British Government of approximately $1,000,000 a year!

Coming down to the period that has elapsed since the postal subsidy act of 1891, we find that it is in this period that the real revival in our steam tonnage has occurred; and it is that revival which alone gives the semblance of progress to our merchant shipping under register. In 1892, our steam tonnage under register amounted to 228,899, a drop of 11,000 tons since the preceding year. It may here be proper to point out that the act of May 10th, 1892, admitting to American register the steamships "Paris" and "New York," led to the construction of the "St. Paul" and "St. Louis," this one act alone effecting an addition to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

our steam shipping under register of 44,600 gross tons. In 1893, our steam shipping under register increased to 261,103, the addition of the "Paris" and "New York" increasing the amount by 21,342 tons. And, in 1899, our steam shipping under register, as has been pointed out, reached 360,030 tons. This average, during eight years, or from 1892 to 1899 inclusive, amounted to 273,198 tons of steam shipping under register, which is an increase in the average of the last eight years of forty-five per cent., as compared with the average during the preceding twenty-six years. This summary of our maritime growth shows the extent to which government subsidies have been a stimulus.

It should be said further, that the provisions of the postal subsidy bill, as originally drafted, were cut thirty-three per cent. before the bill was passed, a reduction that seriously crippled and has greatly retarded the growth of our steam shipping under register. If (as was pointed out in Senator Frye's speech at the opening of the short session of the 56th Congress, when he explained the provisions of the pending shipping bill in detail), the pending shipping bill should be passed, its provisions as to high-speed passenger steamships would scarcely vary from the sum provided in the postal subsidy bill as it first passed the United States Senate without a roll call in 1890. In the light of the present criticism of the provisions of the pending bill, in respect to fast steamships, this significant point has been all but lost sight of, both in and out of Congress.

If the figures of our maritime growth in the foreign trade be compared with those of other leading maritime nations, less reason for exultation will be found than Mr. Windmüller discovered in the tables of the domestic and foreign shipping of the maritime nations which he used in his article in the REVIEW. Mr. Windmüller seems inclined to doubt that ships cost more to build in the United States than in Europe, and he entirely overlooks the fact that the cost of ships in British shipyards at present is abnormally high. Since none of our shipowners has been able to find any American shipbuilders who are willing to build ships in this country as cheaply as they can be built abroad, although they have diligently sought for them, there is not much in the mere assertion of those who only think that they can be built here as cheaply. "Until additional shipyards furnish more vessels," says Mr. Windmüller, "capable of satisfying a larger pro-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

portion of the enormous demand of our export trade, the cost of American steamers will not be lowered." It is the confident belief of almost everybody who has studied the shipping bill now pending, that one of its chief and most immediate accomplishments will be the creation of a number of large shipyards, equipped to meet any demand, of a character to make competition between our own builders much more severe, and likely to force a permanent reduction in the cost of American construction.

Mr. Windmüller presents a fair summary of the essential provisions of the bill now pending, but he contends that "it will fail to accomplish" its "avowed objects." The reason he ascribes for this sweeping opinion is that the subsidies "will chiefly accrue, for some time to come, to American lines which cross the Atlantic and Pacific for the purpose of carrying passengers and expensive freight." He is quite mistaken in this, as the subsidies will chiefly accrue to cargo-carrying ships. But the "expensive freight" carried in fast steamships from the United States is none the less the product of our people than is the inexpensive freight, and happy is the nation which is able to export a larger quantity of "expensive freight" than of inexpensive products in their unmanufactured state! We must not overlook the usefulness of fast steamships as mail carriers. And, whether or not their existence stimulates an increase of passenger traffic, it should be remembered that passengers are not all carried in the cabins, and that those brought hither in the steerage have, generally speaking, been of the greatest assistance in helping our people to develop their almost inexhaustible resources, and thus adding to the nation's visible and tangible wealth. Mr. Windmüller thinks that "what the country really needs is carriage, at reasonable rates, for the immense yield of our agriculture, and for the bulky products of our mines," and he adds that, if ships "were readily obtainable, exports could be further increased," especially, he further points out, in direct communication with the southern portions of our continent. But, in point of fact, all of the testimony presented to the Congressional committees which have favorably reported the shipping bill for passage, goes to show that freight carriers of the most modern, economical and useful type will be constructed in the United States, if the bill passes in its present form.

The Congressional committees which have studied the pend-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing bill had before them every important owner and builder of ships in the United States, during the many months they had the bill under consideration, and their recommendations in its favor are based upon what they regard as facts and arguments establishing its justice, practicability and effectiveness, as well as its superiority over any other alternatives suggested. What Mr. Windmüller says about the usefulness to Great Britain of her policy of giving direct bounties to the seamen who compose her effective naval reserve, is most interesting and timely. That is a subject, however, that may be better dealt with in a separate measure.

The proposition to grant free American registry to foreign built vessels, when carefully considered, proves to be an entirely theoretical suggestion. It seems to free traders to be a natural application of their free trade theories, but in operation it would prove to be entirely impracticable, so far as building up a marine under the American flag is concerned, at the present time. This is the view that has always been held by the shipowners of the United States, people who should be quick to see the advantages of such a policy, if they existed, and to advocate its adoption if it could be shown to be in any way helpful in solving the problem of reviving our mercantile marine in the foreign trade. Mr. Windmüller refers to the time when Great Britain abandoned the laws that confined her registry to British built ships; but it would be interesting to see how any advocate of free ships could prove that the repeal of that law has been of any material advantage to either British shipowners or British shipbuilders, especially since the era of iron and steel. Certainly, British ships are all British built, and, practically speaking, always have been. A law, then, that permits British subjects to purchase foreign built ships, but under which no foreign built ships are actually registered as British, accomplishes nothing for Britons. And certainly it cannot be contended that this law helps British shipbuilders, because it has not affected them in any way. More than that, if the American advocates of this policy of foreign built ships are able to name any American citizen who would be willing, if our laws permitted, to purchase and register foreign built ships as American, and run them in our foreign trade without aid from our Government, they may thus pave the way to its serious consideration.

ALEXANDER R. SMITH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SIKHISM AND THE SIKHS.

BY SIR LEPEL GRIFFIN, K. C. S. I.

SIKHISM, the creed of the brave and hardy race that held dominion over the plain country of the Punjab during the first fifty years of the present century, and disputed the sovereignty of Northern India with the English, well deserves the study of those interested in the birth and development of religions. Like some other creeds, it had its origin in a profound dissatisfaction with the existing order of things, and a passionate endeavor on the part of its founder to break the chain which Brâhmanism had fastened round the feet and hands of every Hindu. Later, under the wholesale stimulus of persecution, it became a fierce and inspiring belief, which changed a nation of peaceful peasants into an army of disciplined warriors, who, guided by a leader of genius, were the most formidable armed force that native India had seen since the days of Aurung-Zeb and Sháh Jehan. The revolt of Sikhism against Brâhmanism resembled that of Protestantism against the Church of Rome, in that it was not a contradiction of dogma, but a resistance to the intolerable pretensions of the priestly class. The doctrines of Luther differed in but few and unimportant particulars from those of the orthodox champions of Catholicism. The theological tangle known as Brâhmanism would have included the doctrinal subtleties and puerilities of Nânak without difficulty. It was itself a compound of mysticism and realism, tolerant and all-embracing—theistic, polytheistic and pantheistic at the same time. It allowed to the ignorant worshipper a myriad gods, from the ochre-stained stone in the forest to the awful personages of the Hindu Trinity; while to the elect, who had risen beyond symbolism to the purer air, it provided conceptions of the Deity as noble and exalted as those to be found in any religion of East or West. But no creed, however lofty in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conception or ethically worthy, is tolerable to free and liberal minds in which the power of interpretation and direction is jealously guarded, as a hereditary right, by a corrupt and prejudiced priesthood. It was against this pretension that the reformers of the West and the East took up arms; and it is a strange coincidence that the teaching of both Luther and Nânak was synchronous, and that they were born and died within a few years of each other.

In this paper all that can be attempted is to show, generally, the line of doctrine expounded by Nânak and his eight successors in the office of Guru or spiritual leader; secondly, to note the important changes introduced by Govind Singh, the tenth Guru and founder of the Church Militant of Sikhism; and, lastly, to observe the practice of the Sikhs of to-day, and the degree in which they have fallen away from the teaching of both Nânak and Govind and reverted to Hindu ceremonial and modes of thought.

When Nânak, who was born in 1469, began his teaching, Hinduism had long crystallized into the sacerdotal guild which we see in India to-day. It may even be said that its religious aspect was then more lost than now in a multitude of ceremonial observances and social prescriptions; for the influence of missionary and proselyting creeds, like Christianity and Islam, has been to draw out what is best in Hinduism and encourage cultivated Hindus to reject the material and grosser part of their creed in favor of its higher esoteric teaching. But then, as now, for the uninstructed mass of the people, Brâhmanism was Hinduism—that is to say, doctrine counted for little or nothing, and the strict observance of the rules of Caste, with the Brâhman as the top-stone of the social pyramid, was everything. Caste had been invented by Brâhmans for Brâhmans; a system by which Hindu society was divided and subdivided by hereditary and impregnable barriers, the Brâhmans remaining a sacred priesthood, immeasurably above all others, directing the lives and conduct of all, and without toll to whom none of the ordinary functions of civil life could be effectively performed. The greedy Brâhman demanded his fees at birth and marriage and death, and to feed Brâhmans was a virtue far above devotion to mercy, truth and justice. It was against this privileged hierarchy that Nânak directed his attack; and, although he did not preach the abolition of Caste as was subsequently done by Govind Singh, his writings are filled

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with acknowledgments of the brotherhood and equality of man, and he admitted all classes as his disciples. Nor did his gentle and quietist nature attempt a direct assault on the Brâhman class, other than by the denunciation of the idol worship on the profits of which they lived. He even allowed and approved the use of Brâhmans as private and domestic priests, to perform such ceremonial as was unobjectionable; though he rejected their teachings, together with the doctrine of Vedas and Purânas, the Hindu sacred books. Born in the Punjab, where the conflict between Hinduism and Islam had long continued, he was doubtless influenced, as had been the *Bhagats* or pious teachers who had preceded him, by the central idea of Mohammedanism, the unity of God; and monotheism was the cardinal truth of his doctrine.

It is necessary to study carefully his Gospel, known as the Adi Granth, to realize adequately the purity and beauty of Nânak's doctrine. This enormous volume is somewhat repellent to Western scholars. The only form in which it is accessible—for the Gûrmukhi in which it is written is exceedingly obscure—is the translation of Dr. Ernest Trumpp, a learned German professor, who was brought to Lahore at a time when I was Chief Secretary to the Punjab Government to undertake this difficult task, on which he spent seven years' labor. But his command of English was not equal to a rendering of the spirit of the original, and he further appears to have considered the Granth as an incoherent and shallow production, and its chief value to be linguistic, as a treasury of the mediæval Hindu dialects. This judgment appears to me to be mistaken. There are, it is true, many puerilities and vain repetitions from which the books of no Eastern religion are free; but it is scarcely possible to turn a single page without being struck by the beauty and originality of the images and the enlightened devotion of its language. No Catholic ascetic has ever been more absorbed in the contemplation of the Deity than was the prophet Nânak when giving utterance to his rhapsodies.

The monotheism of Nânak is often not to be distinguished from Pantheism; and, unless a creed be provided with a personal and anthropomorphic deity, it is always difficult to draw the line between the two. Sometimes Nânak represents God as a self-conscious spirit protecting the creatures He has made; an ever-present Providence, Who can be approached through the Guru, the heaven-appointed teacher, and ready to bless and emancipate

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the soul which worships sincerely and humbly. At other times, man and the universe and all that exists are but a part of and an emanation from God, Who produces all things out of Himself and to Whom all finally return. In the same way, it would seem that Nânak in no way denied the existence of the lower deities of the Hindu mythology; for the poetic pantheism on which his belief in the one supreme God was based could hardly exist without the symbolism which inspired all nature with life, and found a spiritual force behind and within every manifestation of natural energy. Yet all such deities he asserted to be indifferent and unworthy of regard, much as the early preachers of Christianity treated the gods of Greece and Rome, in whose existence they believed, but whose dominion was to be overthrown by Christ. Idolatry he condemned, and the service pleasing to the Deity was that of the heart; neither vain ceremonies nor the austerities which the Hindu ascetics had been wont to consider as the key which unlocked the highest and most secret mysteries, but a pure, unselfish life, a faith in God revealed through the instrumentality of the appointed Guru or spiritual guide. Charity and good works were commendable and the worthy fruits of an unselfish life; but they were not of themselves sufficient to release the soul from its bondage to sense and illusion, or to save it from transmigration, the ever-present dread of the Hindu, or to insure its reunion with God. These results could only be attained by meditation on God and through the saving grace of His name.

Although Nânak claimed to be a prophet, he did not assert that he was inspired or possessed of miraculous powers, though these were freely ascribed to him by his disciples, both during his lifetime and after his death. But he magnified his office of Guru into that of an intermediary between man and God, and blind obedience to the Guru was enjoined as an essential article of faith. The Guru's saving power was such that contact with him brought salvation to the most criminal. In short, the virtue of the Guru was supreme; and, although Nânak himself claimed no special sanctity, but spoke of himself as an ignorant and sinful man, yet the Gurus who succeeded him and who possessed more ambition and less piety, were virtually deified by their followers; and the worship of the Guru and the surrender to him of the wealth, the honor and the life of his followers, became as grievous a burden to the Sikh community as the yoke of the Brâhmans had been.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The doctrine of transmigration of souls was common to Sikhism, Hinduism and Buddhism—the belief in the continued existence of the soul, through countless changes into various forms of animal and human existences, until by the virtue of the Guru and the saving power of the name of God, final emancipation was attained and absorption into the Supreme, when individuality ended. This practical annihilation, which the loss of individuality signifies to the less subtle fancy of Europeans, was the chief object of the religious strivings of the Sikh or Hindu, and it was the reward of virtue and of faith in God. It was thus from a different standpoint that life and death were regarded by Eastern and Western thinkers. To the former life is a burden from which the soul should seek release in forgetfulness and darkness; to the latter, the idea of a happy immortality, as the reward for a virtuous earthly life, is the one thought which permits life to be borne with cheerfulness, and death faced with equanimity. But the troubles and enigmas which have confused and perplexed many Christian communities found their exact counterpart in Sikhism. There was the same conflict between predestination, election and free will. The sacred name was only communicated by the Guru to those upon whose forehead had been imprinted, from the beginning, the sign which designated him as one of the elect. Destiny was absolute and supreme. Man was represented as a puppet, whom the Master made to dance as it pleased Him. In every breast, goodness, passion or darkness was predominant, and human actions were necessarily the result of the influence that swayed them. Illusion had been spread around all earthly things; man was deceived by a Power above and without him; and he was irresponsible, seeing that the impulse of his conduct was beyond his control. It was hopeless to attempt to reconcile the doctrines of predestination and free will, the choice of good or evil, and a system of rewards and punishments, with the fixed decree of an unchanging destiny; and the attempt was probably made in order to account for the inequalities, the sorrow and suffering of human life, the perplexity of which had lain at the root of the Hindu doctrine of the transmigration of souls.

It is not possible here to discuss the dogmas of Sikhism as expounded by Nânak in more detail. He was a true prophet, and accomplished worthily an exalted mission. His system, like all systems, had many imperfections; and chief of them were those

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which equally belonged to Calvinism, in the substitution of one tyranny for another, and the overshadowing of all human joy by a predestined lot which no faith or virtue could modify. But the good far outweighed the evil. Nânak taught the wisdom and omnipotence of one Supreme God, and the equality of all men, of whatever race or creed, in His sight; purity of life, charity, humility, and temperance. He enjoined kindness to animals, and forbade both female infanticide and the burning of widows. He condemned idolatry and asceticism, and preached the wholesome doctrine that the state of the worker and householder was the most honorable condition, and that, to find God and serve Him, it was not necessary to practice austerities or retire from active life. His object, in which he largely succeeded, was to purge Hinduism of the dross which had gathered about it; to lift it from the slough of polytheism and vain ceremonial in which it was choked, and to bring it back to the firm ground and the pure air of the Vedas. His mission, at the close of the fifteenth century, was the same as that of Raja Lâl Mohan Roy and Keshab Chandar Sen in the nineteenth; but his originality was the greater, for his impulse was not, like theirs, the necessary result of contact with European culture and modes of thought, which are largely and beneficially affecting Hinduism. The missionary teaching of Christianity affects educated Hindus little if at all; but the science and literature of the West are playing an important part in purifying Hinduism of its materialism, and bringing it back to its ancient monotheism, or to that state of suspension of judgment which is somewhat inadequately designated agnosticism.

The successors of Nânak, who held the Guruship from 1538 to 1675 A. D., were of far inferior capacity and disinterestedness, and do not require much mention. It was the fourth Guru, Râm Dâs, who founded the famous city of Amritsar, and built the Golden Temple in the middle of the Tank of Nectar, thus giving to the Sikh people a centre for worship; while Arjan, the fifth Guru, systematized the theocracy, collected taxes and assumed something of the state of a secular ruler. His death was due to the tyranny of the Mohammedan Government, which then, from its capital of Delhi, ruled the greater part of the Indian peninsula; and from that date, 1606 A. D., commenced an obstinate quarrel between Sikhs and Mohammedans, which continued until, in the general crush of the Mogul Empire, at the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

beginning of the present century, the former seized supreme power in the Punjab. Nor is the hostility between them at an end at the present day, and the Sikh warriors, in 1857, followed the call of the English to Delhi and Lucknow, to avenge their slaughtered prophets and co-religionists of days long past. The stern measures of repression which the Moslem Governors employed against the Sikhs were in some measure justified by the turbulent character of these sectaries who lived by plunder and levied contributions upon all who were not of their persuasion. But the fierceness of their hatred to Mohammedanism and its steady flame were due to the religious bigotry of the Emperor Aurung-Zeb, who considered it a sacred duty to destroy all who would not accept Islâm, and whose savage fanaticism hastened the decay of the Mogul power. No creed endures the foundation stones of which have not been cemented with blood; and the persecutions of Aurung-Zeb only united the Sikhs more closely in resistance to his rule, until at last a man arose among them who possessed spiritual authority and organizing power, and who changed the whole complexion of the Sikh creed. This was Govind Singh, the tenth and last Guru, who, on the martyrdom of his father, became leader of the sect till his death in 1708. The changes introduced by Govind, though fundamental, were not doctrinal. He was, indeed, no quietist like Nânak, but a man of action, animated by the passion of revenge. The monotheistic theory he did not dispute; but his patron saint, so to speak, was the fierce goddess Dûrga, to whom he is said to have offered a human sacrifice to inaugurate his mission. He formed the Sikhs into a military brotherhood under the name of the Khâlsâ. He abolished caste altogether, which Nânak had never ventured to do; and, although this offended many of the better classes, it was received with enthusiasm by the lower orders who flocked to his standard. He instituted an initiatory rite of baptism, known as the *pâhul*, a feast of communion, and a distinctive dress to distinguish his disciples from other Hindus. Sikhs were forbidden to cut their hair or beard, to gamble or to smoke tobacco; but intoxicating liquors were allowed, and the richer classes have always been hard drinkers, though the peasants are temperate enough. No regard was to be paid to Vedas, Shâstras or the Korân, neither to Hindu priests or Mohammedan mullahs; visits to temples and shrines and the observance of Hindu ceremonies

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at birth, marriage and death were alike forbidden. The mild law of Nânak was transformed into a gospel of intolerance and hate, directed not only against his bitter enemies, the Mohammedans, but against the members of all alien creeds and non-conforming Sikh sects, of which several had arisen. But the Mohammedans were the chief objects of Sikh hatred. To salute one of the accursed race was a crime worthy of hell, and the life-long duty of the Sikh was to slay Mohammedans and wage constant war upon them. The results of this teaching and practice turned the Punjâb, for a hundred years, into an arena of bloodshed. Mohammedan conquerors from Central Asia and Afghânistân swooped down upon the dying Mogul empire, and occupied the northern capital, Lahore, and established Viceroys and Governors. But, with varying fortunes, the conflict with the Sikhs always continued, until it was finally decided by the gradual conquest of the Punjab by Mâharâja Runjit Singh.

Of all the men who carved principalities out of the inheritance of the Emperors of Delhi, the most remarkable was Runjit Singh. He possessed the genius both of war and of government. The son of the chief of one of the smaller Sikh military confederacies, he attacked and overcame all rivals and competitors of his own faith, and then turned his sword against the Mohammedans, annexing in turn the Afghân provinces of Multân, Kashmîr, Peshâwur and the Derajât, which is the name of the long strip of plain country that lies between the Indus and the mountains on the northwestern frontier of Hindostan. In the Afghâns he met an enemy equal to the Sikhs in bravery and fanaticism; the contest was for many years undecided, and cost the Mâharâja heavily, both in men and treasure. But the discipline and arms of the Sikhs gave Runjit Singh the final advantage; and, at his death in 1839, he was the undisputed ruler of the Punjâb and Kashmir.

Those who care to know in more detail my estimate of Runjit Singh, his character, his mode of government, his counsellors, his army and his conquests, may find it in his biography, which I wrote in 1892, for the University of Oxford. There is only space here to note the influence of his reign on the religious side of Sikhism. This was partly good and partly evil. The fierce intolerance of Govind Singh was abandoned by the Mâharâja for an absolute indifference to religion, further than was necessary to retain the allegiance of the Sikhs and secure the personal

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

adherence of their religious guides, Bábás and Bhais, whom he largely subsidized and treated with every outward mark of respect. But in his eyes the creed of his servants mattered nothing, so long as they served him well. Several of his most trusted and capable Ministers were Mohammedans, and many were Brâhmans, whose employment Govind Singh had distinctly forbidden. The Sikhs, chiefs and people, were plain soldiers, utterly illiterate; and no place could be found for them in a system of government so complicated as that of the Mâharâja, where Brâhmans and Mohammedans of education, experienced through long generations in all the arts of government, were necessary to the maintenance of his position. Even in the army, the same spirit of tolerance was found. Diwân Mokham Chand, a Khattri Hindu, was probably his best general; and Irish, Italian and French officers trained and led important divisions of his forces.

This tolerance in matters of religious belief removed the darkest blot from the ferocious creed of Govind, and allowed the Sikhs to enter the community of reasonable and civilized men; for, during the eighteenth century, their hand was against every man, and plunder and slaughter were the law of their being. This reform, selfish though it was in its origin, so modified and elevated the Sikh polity and character that its advantage far outweighed the injury to public decency and morality which may have resulted from the violent and treacherous character of the monarch or the drunkenness and profligacy of his life. Morality is conventional, and conduct must be judged by the standard of the age and the environment of the individual. Mâharâja Runjit Singh, in spite of his faults, was a really great monarch, and, like Peter the Great of Russia, who was far more coarse and cruel, he created a State and a nation. The ignorant and brutal Sikh peasants became, by the inspiration of his genius, the most formidable armed force that India had seen during the nineteenth century. Every adult male was a soldier; and, if the religious fervor was not so keen as in the days of Govind Singh, a strong national spirit, almost unknown in India before, had succeeded and supplemented it. Had the great Mâharâja lived in other days, the warlike Sikhs, with such a leader and inspired by so high a spirit, might well have founded an empire co-extensive with that of the Moguls. But the time was inauspicious; the Mâ-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

harâja died prematurely, exhausted by excesses, and the kingdom which he had so laboriously built up collapsed.

It was but a short time after his death, in 1839, that the folly and weakness of his successors brought about a collision with the British Power, which, in a hundred years, with the irresistible force and sureness of a rising tide, had spread over Hindostân from Calcutta to the river Sutlej, and in whose advance the Mâharâja had clearly foreseen and predicted the overthrow of the Sikh monarchy. During his lifetime he had anxiously and consistently maintained friendship with England, and though at times his ambitious schemes led to friction and complaint, yet the loyal determination of the two Governments to preserve peace was effectual. But at his death, the powerful army he had perfected, trained and placed under the command of French and Italian generals of repute, restrained no longer by fear and loyalty, broke into mutiny, seized the supreme power in the state, and at last crossed the frontier and declared war against the British Government. The campaign which followed was exceptionally severe and bloody. Never before in India had the English met an enemy so formidable—a disciplined army with weapons equal to their own, and an artillery more numerous and powerful. After a series of hotly contested battles, in which more than once victory was perilously near defeat, the English entered Lahore in triumph, and commenced the experiment, always doubtful and dangerous in the East, of a puppet monarch and a necessarily ineffective control. This sure receipt for disaffection and intrigue brought about a fresh revolt of the Sikh army, which had no desire to beat its swords into ploughshares before it had made another trial of strength with the English. The ensuing campaign, as severe as but briefer than the first, was decisive, and the whole of the Punjab was annexed to the British Dominions in 1849. The Sikhs, like gallant soldiers, accepted the inevitable without bitterness. Their national sentiment was not outraged by the result of a contest in which they had honorably striven, on almost equal terms, with the Power which had successively overthrown all the great military organizations of Hindostân, and which was careful to allow them as free and full expression of Sikh teaching and practice as the Mâharâja himself; which willingly enrolled their disbanded soldiers in its own armies, and renewed and confirmed the endowments of their beloved religion. From that day to this, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Sikhs have shown themselves the most loyal and devoted subjects of the Queen. When the Bengal army, in 1857, was driven into mutiny by the crass stupidity and criminal carelessness of the military authorities, the Sikh Mâharâjas, chiefs and people, sprang again to arms, and fought with the utmost gallantry by the side of the British, whom they had learned to respect.

Fifty years have passed since the annexation of the Punjab, and it will be interesting to know what kind of men are the Sikhs of to-day; how far civilization and education and orderly government have affected or modified their characteristics, and how the later phase of their religion, as taught by Govind Singh, has fared in the uncongenial atmosphere of peace. I have long lived among the Sikhs, and was Chief Magistrate of their principal districts of Lahore and Amritsar; and during several years I was officially employed in writing the histories of the independent chiefs and nobles of the Punjab. Indeed, at one time, there was scarcely a single Sikh of position with whom I was not personally acquainted. My experience is that no one can live in intimate relations with the Sikh people, chiefs or peasants, with any other feeling than confidence, respect and affection. They are a singularly sincere, simple and warm-hearted race, susceptible to kindness and giving a most loyal service to those whom they trust. This description applies not to Sikhs alone, but to the great agricultural tribe of Jats, from which the Sikhs were mostly drawn, and in which they are often re-absorbed. The Jats are the most important people in the Punjab, and are widely spread from Delhi to the Indus. Nearly connected with the Râjpûts in origin, they have many characteristics which separate them from that noble stock, for they are almost universally employed in agriculture, which the Râjpûts, as a rule, dislike or despise. But the Jats are the backbone of the revenue-paying population, peaceful, when not excited by fanaticism or oppression, self-restrained, sober, industrious and independent. Their love of freedom and independence is their most striking characteristic, giving them an open and manly frankness which invites the sympathy of Englishmen with whom they have so much in common.

The value of the Sikhs as soldiers has an important bearing on the future of the British Empire in the East, not in India alone, but in all other regions in which native troops can be profitably employed; and it is an interesting question to determine

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

how far the modern conditions of the Punjab affect the military qualities of the Sikhs and the adherence of new disciples to the Sikh creed. For it must be remembered that Sikhism is a matter of profession and election, not of hereditary necessity, like the caste system of Brâhmanism. The baptism of initiation is not ordinarily administered to the sons of a Sikh until they are adult, never before the age of seven years, while to women, except in rare cases, it is not given at all. It will be obvious that there no longer exist the same strong impulse and attraction to Sikhism as in the time of Govind Singh, or still more during the reign of Runjit Singh, when every Sikh was a favored member of a dominant class. The change of tendency was very marked in the first census taken in the Punjab after annexation, when the number of recorded Sikhs was small; though too great stress should not be laid on statistics at such a time, when concealment of creed may have been due to doubt as to the treatment the Sikhs would receive from their new rulers. When it was found that the British bore no animosity toward them, and that, on the contrary, they were anxious to utilize so admirable a fighting race, the numbers who presented themselves for initiation rapidly increased; and, in the five districts where Sikhs most abound, the numbers recorded in 1868 and 1881 were three times as great as in the first census. Other causes assisted to stimulate the religious impulse. The Indian mutiny, during which all Sikh recruits were welcomed to the British army, gave an impetus to the creed, and the *Pax Britannica* which has been observed for so many years within the borders of Hindostân has not prevented the Sikhs from enjoying plenty of fighting in other parts of the world. In Afghânistân and on the North-West Frontier, in China and the Soudan, the Sikhs have always been in the van and have covered themselves with glory; while in Burmah, Singapore and Hongkong they form an admirable body of military police. Among the fighting races of the world, the Sikh holds a very high place, nor do I believe that for the highest qualities of a soldier there is any one his superior. Led by British officers, I believe Sikhs to be far better troops, steadier and more intelligent, than the majority of those found in European armies. The Gûrkhas are equally good, but of these the number of recruits is limited. The value of the Sikh is increased by his freedom from caste prejudice, which permits his employment beyond the sea or in conditions where

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Brâhman, the Râjpût or the ordinary Hindu would find it impossible to live without incurring social ostracism. The Sikh is as gallant and impetuous in attack as he is imperturbable in defense or reverse. Exceedingly temperate and enduring, the severest hardships are borne cheerfully and without complaint, and he is always ready to risk or sacrifice his life, without a thought, when led by officers who are worthy of him. No praise which can be given to this incomparable soldier is above his deserts. At the same time, it must not be supposed that the Sikhs collectively are such a fighting race as in the days of the great Mâharâja. Soon after annexation, the Punjab was disarmed in the interests of public order, and the men who had been accustomed to redress their own wrongs with the sword which hung ever at their side were compelled to carry their complaints to the courts of law, and to find in the discipline of the regular army the only safety-valve for their martial enthusiasm. So it happened that a very large number of the Sikhs, peasants and landholders, gave up their fighting habits, and became again peaceful agriculturists, one or two members of the family taking the *pâhul* and joining the army, with the warlike affix of Singh to their name, the others remaining Hindus and not to be distinguished by dress or mode of life from their Jat kinsmen, among whom they lived. But the Sikh fighting quality has in no way deteriorated, although the available quantity has become less.

The religious ardor of the Sikhs, under the discipline of the regular army and the orderly progress of civil life, has become an almost burthensome encumbrance and in no way enhances their value as soldiers. Its decline is only to be regretted in that it diminishes the number of recruits to the military caste, for the Hindu Jat peasant, although equally staunch with the Sikh, has not the same inclination to warlike pursuits and prefers to cultivate his ancestral fields. Day by day, the new faith of Govind loses its hold over the people, and the old creed of Hinduism, with its Brâhmanical sacerdotalism and its worship of strange gods, is taking its place. The Sikh still, from time to time, visits the temple to listen to the reading of the Granth; he abstains from tobacco and leaves his hair and beard unshorn, while his observance of caste restrictions is lax, and he is content to take food from even the hands of a Mohammedan. But the Brâhman has now again become an object of reverence and is called to officiate

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at births and marriages; the men, and especially the women, always most superstitious and most ready to accept priestly control, visit the idol temples and local shrines; and, in those districts of the Punjab most distant from the religious centre, there is little to distinguish the Sikh of to-day from the ordinary Hindu. This laxity in faith gave rise, some thirty years ago, to a movement which caused some anxiety to the Government, when a carpenter, named Ram Singh, founded a new sect, the Kûkas, and attempted to draw his co-religionists back into the path of orthodoxy. He preached Govind Singh as the only true Guru, and insisted upon the abolition of caste, abstinence from animal food, tobacco and intoxicating liquors, free intermarriage and the neglect of Hindu priests and temples with all their idolatrous symbolism. So long as the Kûka teaching only aimed at religious reform, the Government did not interfere, although respectable citizens were scandalized at the debauchery which prevailed in the Kûka mixed assemblies. But when, like Govind Singh, they changed religion into a political propaganda, proclaimed the restoration of the Khâlsâ and the overthrow of the British Government, and proceeded to insurrection and murder, the sect was suppressed with a heavy hand; the leaders, arrested in one night throughout the province, were deported to Burmah, Aden and the Andamans, and the Kûka revival, after a short time, was heard of no more. But, although religious fanaticism always contains the germs of possible danger, it is a matter of regret that Sikhism, which, as taught by its first prophet Nânak, was so full of promise, and was inspired by a pure morality and a high conception of the Deity, should fall back again into the idolatrous materialism from which for a time he had raised it. But the recuperative and absorbing power of Brâhmanism is very great. History records how it overthrew and expelled the creed of Buddhism from Hindostân, and it seems about to repeat the process with Sikhism.

For the British Government of India it is desirable, so far as may be practicable, to stimulate and encourage the life and growth of a martial spirit in the fighting races of India. They form an invaluable reserve of military power, which may be counted upon with confidence so long as the administration is popular and commends itself to the conscience of the people as just and beneficent. But it is difficult to take any steps which might seem to favor a sentiment so closely interwoven with re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ligious principle and practice, when the declared basis of British policy is a strict religious neutrality. This has not, it is true, prevented the continuance of ancient endowments to the temples and shrines of the Sikh, Hindu and Mohammedan religions; but the tendency has been to reduce and terminate these wherever possible, and to withdraw from the state the management of all religious institutions. The endowments of the Golden Temple at Amritsar are now but scanty, and it has lost in great part the rich offerings which were made freely by Râjas and Mâharâjas when they paid their annual visits to the shrine around which their Bungas or hostels still stand. The policy of the old East India Company was more sympathetic and encouraged the endowment of the several religions of India—a practice to be logically defended on the ground that the people who paid the taxes and furnished the state revenue should have a portion thereof devoted to the maintenance of the public worship of the national creeds, such as Brâhmanism, Mohammedanism and Sikhism. But, as the tendency of higher statesmanship grows more agnostic, the less does it seem able or disposed to oppose the pressure of an aggressive proselytizing spirit, which seems to grow in fervor with the absence of resistance; which has caused serious evil in China, which threatens trouble in the Soudan, and which will be the cause of future danger throughout the Eastern World. There can be little doubt that a purely secular education is, for the great mass of the people, inconsistent with the highest realization of the duties of citizenship, and that ethical teaching cannot be altogether divorced from religious sanctions. All the scientific and philosophical religions have a satisfactory ethical basis, and a Government like that of India, which professes to evenly hold the balance between competing creeds, and which has solemnly promised to abstain from pressing Christianity upon its Indian subjects, should endeavor, by the liberal, judicious and impartial endowment of all religions accepted by large sections of the community, to conciliate the priestly class, which now stands aloof, unfriendly or hostile, and thus promote not only loyalty to the ruling power, but the growth of a higher morality which finds no sufficient sustenance in the dry and barren teaching of Western literature and science.

LEPEL GRIFFIN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MARK TWAIN: AN INQUIRY.

BY W. D. HOWELLS.

Two recent events have concurred to offer criticism a fresh excuse, if not a fresh occasion, for examining the literary work of Mr. Samuel L. Clemens, better known to the human family by his pseudonym of Mark Twain. One of these events is the publication of his writings in a uniform edition,* which it is to be hoped will remain indefinitely incomplete; the other is his return to his own country after an absence so long as to form a psychological perspective in which his characteristics make a new appeal.

I.

The uniform edition of Mr. Clemens's writings is of that dignified presence which most of us have thought their due in moments of high pleasure with their quality, and high dudgeon with their keeping in the matchlessly ugly subscription volumes of the earlier issues. Yet now that we have them in this fine shape, fit every one, in its elect binding, paper and print, to be set on the shelf of a gentleman's library, and not taken from it without some fear of personal demerit, I will own a furtive regret for the hideous blocks and bricks of which the visible temple of the humorist's fame was first builded. It was an advantage to meet the author in a guise reflecting the accidental and provisional moods of a unique talent finding itself out; and the pictures which originally illustrated the process were helps to the imagination such as the new uniform edition does not afford. In great part it could not retain them, for reasons which the recollection of their uncouth vigor will suggest, but these reasons do not hold in all cases, and especially in the case of Mr. Dan Beard's extraordinarily sympathetic and interpretative pictures for "The Connecticut Yankee at King Arthur's Court." The illustrations of the uni-

*"The Royal Edition of Mark Twain's Works," published by the American Publishing Company, Hartford, Conn.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

form edition, in fact, are its weak side, but it can be said that they do not detract from one's delight in the literature; no illustrations could do that; and, in compensation for their defect, the reader has the singularly intelligent and agreeable essay of Mr. Brander Matthews on Mr. Clemens's work, by way of introduction to the collection. For the rest one may acquit one's self of one's whole duty to the uniform edition by reminding the reader that in the rich variety of its inclusion are those renowning books, "The Innocents Abroad" and "Roughing It;" the first constructive fiction on the larger scale, "Tom Sawyer" and "Huckleberry Finn;" the later books of travel, "A Tramp Abroad" and "Following the Equator," the multiplicity of tales, sketches, burlesques, satires and speeches, together with the spoil of Mr. Clemens's courageous forays in the region of literary criticism, and his later romances, "The Connecticut Yankee," "The American Claimant," and the "Joan of Arc." These complete an array of volumes which the most unconventional reviewer can hardly keep from calling goodly, and which is responsive to the spirit of the literature in a certain desultory and insuccessive arrangement.

II.

So far as I know Mr. Clemens is the first writer to use in extended writing the fashion we all use in thinking, and to set down the thing that comes into his mind without fear or favor of the thing that went before, or the thing that may be about to follow. I, for instance, in putting this paper together, am anxious to observe some sort of logical order, to discipline such impressions and notions as I have of the subject into a coherent body which shall march column-wise to a conclusion obvious if not inevitable from the start. But Mr. Clemens, if he were writing it, would not be anxious to do any such thing. He would take whatever offered itself to his hand out of that mystical chaos, that divine ragbag, which we call the mind, and leave the reader to look after relevancies and sequences for himself. These there might be, but not of that hard and fast sort which I am eager to lay hold of, and the result would at least be satisfactory to the author, who would have shifted the whole responsibility to the reader, with whom it belongs, at least as much as with the author. In other words, Mr. Clemens uses in work on the larger scale the method of the elder essayists, and you know no more where you are going

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to bring up in "The Innocents Abroad" or "Following the Equator" than in an essay of Montaigne. The end you arrive at is the end of the book, and you reach it amused but edified, and sorry for nothing but to be there. You have noted the author's thoughts, but not his order of thinking; he has not attempted to trace the threads of association between the things that have followed one another; his reason, not his logic, has convinced you, or rather it has persuaded you, for you have not been brought under conviction. It is not certain that this method is of design with Mr. Clemens; that might spoil it; and possibly he will be as much surprised as any one to know that it is his method. It is imaginable that he pursues it from no wish but to have pleasure of his work, and not to fatigue either himself or his reader; and his method may be the secret of his vast popularity, but it cannot be the whole secret of it. Any one may compose a scrap-book, and offer it to the public with nothing of Mark Twain's good fortune. Everything seems to depend upon the nature of the scraps, after all; his scraps might have been consecutively arranged, in a studied order, and still have immensely pleased; but there is no doubt that people like things that have at least the appearance of not having been drilled into line. Life itself has that sort of appearance as it goes on; it is an essay with moments of drama in it, rather than a drama; it is a lesson, with the precepts appearing haphazard, and not precept upon precept; it is a school, but not always a school-room; it is a temple, but the priests are not always in their sacerdotal robes; sometimes they are eating the sacrifice behind the altar and pouring the libations for the god through the channels of their dusty old throats. An instinct of something chaotic, ironic, empiric in the order of experience seems to have been the inspiration of our humorist's art, and what finally remains with the reader, after all the joking and laughing, is not merely the feeling of having had a mighty good time, but the conviction that he has got the worth of his money. He has not gone through the six hundred pages of "The Innocents Abroad," or "Following the Equator," without having learned more of the world as the writer saw it than any but the rarest traveller is able to show for his travel; and possibly with his average, practical American public, which was his first tribunal, and must always be his court of final appeal, Mark Twain justified himself for being so in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

structive. If this bold notion is admissible it seems the moment to say that no writer ever imparted information more inoffensively.

But his great charm is his absolute freedom in a region where most of us are fettered and shackled by immemorial convention. He saunters out into the trim world of letters, and lounges across its neatly kept paths, and walks about on the grass at will, in spite of all the signs that have been put up from the beginning of literature, warning people of dangers and penalties for the slightest trespass.

One of the characteristics I observe in him is his single-minded use of words, which he employs as Grant did to express the plain, straight meaning their common acceptance has given them with no regard to their structural significance or their philological implications. He writes English as if it were a primitive and not a derivative language, without Gothic or Latin or Greek behind it, or German and French beside it. The result is the English in which the most vital works of English literature are cast, rather than the English of Milton, and Thackeray, and Mr. Henry James. I do not say that the English of the authors last named is less than vital, but only that it is not the most vital. It is scholarly and conscious; it knows who its grandfather was; it has the refinement and subtlety of an old patriciate. You will not have with it the widest suggestion, the largest human feeling, or perhaps the loftiest reach of imagination, but you will have the keen joy that exquisite artistry in words can alone impart, and that you will not have in Mark Twain. What you will have in him is a style which is as personal, as biographical as the style of any one who has written, and expresses a civilization whose ccurage of the chances, the preferences, the duties, is not the measure of its essential modesty. It has a thing to say, and it says it in the word that may be the first, or second, or third choice, but will not be the instrument of the most fastidious ear, the most delicate and exacting sense, though it will be the word that surely and strongly conveys intention from the author's mind to the reader's. It is the Abraham Lincolnian word, not the Charles Sumnerian; it is American, Western.

III.

Now that Mark Twain has become a fame so world-wide, we should be in some danger of forgetting, but for his help, how en-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tirely American he is, and we have already forgotten, perhaps, how truly Western he is, though his work, from first to last, is always reminding us of the fact. But here I should like to distinguish. It is not alone in its generous humor, with more honest laughter in it than humor ever had in the world till now, that his work is so Western. Any one who has really known the West (and really to know it one must have lived it), is aware of the profoundly serious, the almost tragical strain which is the fundamental tone in the movement of such music as it has. Up to a certain point, in the presence of the mystery which we call life, it trusts and hopes and laughs; beyond that it doubts and fears, but it does not cry. It is more likely to laugh again, and in the work of Mark Twain there is little of the pathos which is supposed to be the ally of humor, little suffusion of apt tears from the smiling eyes. It is too sincere for that sort of play; and if after the doubting and the fearing it laughs again, it is with a suggestion of that resentment which youth feels when the disillusion from its trust and hope comes, and which is the grim second-mind of the West in the presence of the mystery. It is not so much the race-effect as the region-effect; it is not the Anglo-American finding expression, it is the Westerner, who is not more thoroughly the creature of circumstances, of conditions, but far more dramatically their creature, than any prior man. He found himself placed in them and under them, so near to a world in which the natural and primitive was obsolete, that while he could not escape them, neither could he help challenging them. The inventions, the appliances, the improvements of the modern world invaded the hoary eld of his rivers and forests and prairies, and while he was still a pioneer, a hunter, a trapper, he found himself confronted with the financier, the scholar, the gentleman. They seemed to him, with the world they represented, at first very droll, and he laughed. Then they set him thinking, and as he never was afraid of anything, he thought over the whole field, and demanded explanations of all his prepossessions, of equality, of humanity, of representative government and revealed religion. When they had not their answers ready, without accepting the conventions of the modern world as solutions or in any manner final, he laughed again, not mockingly, but patiently, compassionately. Such, or somewhat like this, was the genesis and evolution of Mark Twain.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Missouri was Western, but it was also Southern, not only in the institution of slavery, to the custom and acceptance of which Mark Twain was born and bred without any applied doubt of its divinity, but in the peculiar social civilization of the older South from which his native State was settled. It would be reaching too far out to claim that American humor, of the now prevailing Western type, is of Southern origin, but without staying to attempt it I will say that I think the fact could be established; and I think one of the most notably Southern traits of Mark Twain's humor is its power of seeing the fun of Southern seriousness, but this vision did not come to him till after his liberation from neighborhood in the vaster far West. He was the first, if not the only man of his section, to betray a consciousness of the grotesque absurdities in the Southern inversion of the civilized ideals in behalf of slavery, which must have them upside down in order to walk over them safely. No American of Northern birth or breeding could have imagined the spiritual struggle of Huck Finn in deciding to help the negro Jim to his freedom, even though he should be forever despised as a negro thief in his native town, and perhaps eternally lost through the blackness of his sin. No Northerner could have come so close to the heart of a Kentucky feud, and revealed it so perfectly, with the whimsicality playing through its carnage, or could have so brought us into the presence of the sardonic comi-tragedy of the squalid little river town where the store-keeping magnate shoots down his drunken tormentor in the arms of the drunkard's daughter, and then cows with bitter mockery the mob that comes to lynch him. The strict religiosity compatible in the Southwest with savage precepts of conduct is something that could make itself known in its amusing contrast only to the native Southwesterner, and the revolt against it is as constant in Mark Twain as the enmity to New England orthodoxy is in Dr. Holmes. But he does not take it with such serious resentment as Dr. Holmes is apt to take his inherited Puritanism, and it may be therefore that he is able to do it more perfect justice, and impart it more absolutely. At any rate there are no more vital passages in his fiction than those which embody character as it is affected for good as well as evil by the severity of the local Sunday-schooling and church-going.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IV.

I find myself, in spite of the discipline I intend for this paper, speaking first of the fiction, which by no means came first in Mark Twain's literary development. It is true that his beginnings were in short sketches, more or less inventive, and studies of life in which he let his imagination play freely; but it was not till he had written "Tom Sawyer" that he could be called a novelist. Even now I think he should rather be called a romancer, though such a book as "Huckleberry Finn" takes itself out of the order of romance and places itself with the great things in picaresque fiction. Still it is more poetic than picaresque, and of a deeper psychology. The probable and credible soul that the author divines in the son of the town drunkard is one which we might each own brother, and the art which portrays this nature at first hand in the person and language of the hero, without pose or affectation, is fine art. In the boy's history the author's fancy works realistically to an end as high as it has reached elsewhere, if not higher; and I who like "The Connecticut Yankee at King Arthur's Court" so much, have half a mind to give my whole heart to "Huckleberry Finn."

Both "Huckleberry Finn" and "Tom Sawyer" wander in episodes loosely related to the main story, but they are of a closer and more logical advance from the beginning to the end than the fiction which preceded them, and which I had almost forgotten to name before them. We owe to "The Gilded Age" a type in Colonel Mulberry Sellers which is as likely to endure as any fictitious character of our time. It embodies the sort of Americanism which survived through the civil war, and characterized in its boundlessly credulous, fearlessly adventurous, unconsciously burlesque excess the period of political and economic expansion which followed the war. Colonel Sellers was, in some rough sort, the America of that day, which already seems so remote, and is best imaginable through him. Yet the story itself was of the fortuitous structure of what may be called the autobiographical books, such as "The Innocents Abroad" and "Roughing It." Its desultory and accidental character was heightened by the cooperation of Mr. Clemens's fellow humorist, Charles Dudley Warner, and such coherence as it had was weakened by the diverse qualities of their minds and their irreconcilable ideals in lit-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

erature. These never combined to a sole effect or to any variety of effects that left the reader very clear what the story was all about; and yet from the cloudy solution was precipitated at least one character which, as I have said, seems of as lasting substance and lasting significance as any which the American imagination has evolved from the American environment.

If Colonel Sellers is Mr. Clemens's supreme invention, as it seems to me, I think that his "The Connecticut Yankee" is his greatest achievement in the way of a greatly imagined and symmetrically developed romance. Of all the fanciful schemes in fiction it pleases me most, and I give myself with absolute delight to its notion of a keen East Hartford Yankee finding himself, by a retroactionary spell, at the court of King Arthur of Britain, and becoming part of the sixth century with all the customs and ideas of the nineteenth in him and about him. The field for humanizing satire which this scheme opens is illimitable; but the ultimate achievement, the last poignant touch, the most exquisite triumph of the book, is the return of the Yankee to his own century, with his look across the gulf of the ages at the period of which he had been a part and his vision of the sixth century woman he had loved holding their child in her arms.

It is a great fancy, transcending in æsthetic beauty the invention in "The Prince and Pauper," with all the delightful and affecting implications of that charming fable, and excelling the heartrending story in which Joan of Arc lives and prophesies and triumphs and suffers. She is indeed realized to the modern sense as few figures of the past have been realized in fiction; and is none the less of her time and of all time because her supposititious historian is so recurrently of ours. After Sellers, and Huck Finn, and Tom Sawyer, and the Connecticut Yankee she is the author's finest creation; and if he had succeeded in portraying no other woman nature, he would have approved himself its fit interpreter in her. I do not think he succeeds so often with that nature as with the boy nature or the man nature, apparently because it does not interest him so much. He will not trouble himself to make women talk like women at all times; oftentimes they talk too much like him, though the simple, homely sort express themselves after their kind; and Mark Twain does not always write men's dialogue so well as he might. He is apt to burlesque the lighter colloquiality, and it is only in the more serious and most tragical

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

junctures that his people utter themselves with veracious simplicity and dignity. That great, burly fancy of his is always tempting him to the exaggeration which is the condition of so much of his personal humor, but which when it invades the drama spoils the illusion. The illusion renews itself in the great moments, but I wish it could be kept infract in the small, and I blame him that he does not rule his fancy better. His imagination is always dramatic in its conceptions, but not always in its expressions; the talk of his people is often inadequate caricature in the ordinary exigencies, and his art contents itself with makeshift in the minor action. Even in "Huck Finn," so admirably proportioned and honestly studied, you find a piece of lawless extravagance hurled in, like the episode of the two strolling actors in the flatboat; their broad burlesque is redeemed by their final tragedy—a prodigiously real and moving passage—but the friend of the book cannot help wishing the burlesque was not there. One laughs, and then despises oneself for laughing, and this is not what Mark Twain often makes you do. There are things in him that shock, and more things that we think shocking, but this may not be so much because of their nature, as because of our want of naturalness; they wound our conventions rather than our convictions. As most women are more the subjects of convention than men, his humor is not for most women; but I have a theory that when women like it they like it far beyond men. Its very excess must satisfy that demand of their insatiate nerves for something that there is enough of; but I offer this conjecture with instant readiness to withdraw it under correction. What I feel rather surer of is that there is something finally feminine in the inconsequence of his ratiocination, and his beautiful confidence that we shall be able to follow him to his conclusion in all those turnings and twistings and leaps and bounds, by which his mind carries itself to any point but that he seems aiming at. Men, in fact, are born of women, and possibly Mark Twain owes his literary method to the colloquial style of some far ancestress who was more concerned in getting there, and amusing herself on the way, than in ordering her steps.

Possibly also it is to this ancestress that he owes the instinct of right and wrong which keeps him clear as to the conditions that formed him, and their injustice. Slavery in a small Missouri river town could not have been the dignified and patriarchal in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stitution which Southerners of the older South are fond of remembering or imagining. In the second generation from Virginia ancestry of this sort, Mark Twain was born to the common necessity of looking out for himself, and while making himself practically of another order of things he felt whatever was fine in the old and could regard whatever was ugly and absurd more tolerantly, more humorously than those who bequeathed him their enmity to it. Fortunately for him, and for us who were to enjoy his humor, he came to his intellectual consciousness in a world so large and free and safe that he could be fair to any wrong while seeing the right so unfailingly; and nothing is finer in him than his gentleness with the error which is simply passive and negative. He gets fun out of it, of course, but he deals almost tenderly with it, and hoards his violence for the superstitions and traditions which are arrogant and active. His pictures of that old river-town, Southwestern life, with its faded and tattered aristocratic ideals and its squalid democratic realities, are pathetic, while they are so unsparingly true and so inapologetically and unaffectedly faithful.

The West, when it began to put itself into literature, could do so without the sense, or the apparent sense, of any older or politer world outside of it; whereas the East was always looking fearfully over its shoulder at Europe, and anxious to account for itself as well as represent itself. No such anxiety as this entered Mark Twain's mind, and it is not claiming too much for the Western influence upon American literature to say that the final liberation of the East from this anxiety is due to the West, and to its ignorant courage or its indifference to its difference from the rest of the world. It would not claim to be superior, as the South did, but it could claim to be humanly equal, or rather it would make no claim at all, but would simply be, and what it was, show itself without holding itself responsible for not being something else.

The Western boy of forty or fifty years ago grew up so close to the primeval woods or fields that their inarticulate poetry became part of his being, and he was apt to deal simply and uncritically with literature when he turned to it, as he dealt with nature. He took what he wanted, and left what he did not like; he used it for the playground, not the workshop of his spirit. Something like this I find true of Mark Twain in peculiar and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

uncommon measure. I do not see any proof in his books that he wished at any time to produce literature, or that he wished to reproduce life. When filled up with an experience that deeply interested him, or when provoked by some injustice or absurdity that intensely moved him, he burst forth, and the outbreak might be altogether humorous, but it was more likely to be humorous with a groundswell of seriousness carrying it profoundly forward. In all there is something curiously, not very definably, elemental, which again seems to me Western. He behaves himself as if he were the first man who was ever up against the proposition in hand. He deals as newly, for instance, with the relations of Shelley to his wife, and with as personal and direct an indignation as if they had never attracted critical attention before; and this is the mind or the mood which he brings to all literature. Life is another affair with him; it is not a discovery, not a surprise; every one else knows how it is; but here is a new world, and he explores it with a ramping joy, and shouts for the reader to come on and see how, in spite of all the lies about it, it is the same old world of men and women, with really nothing in it but their passions and prejudices and hypocrisies. At heart he was always deeply and essentially romantic, and once must have expected life itself to be a fairy dream. When it did not turn out so he found it tremendously amusing still, and his expectation not the least amusing thing in it, but without rancour, without grudge or bitterness in his disillusion, so that his latest word is as sweet as his first. He is deeply and essentially romantic in his literary conceptions, but when it comes to working them out he is helplessly literal and real; he is the impassioned lover, the helpless slave of the concrete. For this reason, for his wish, his necessity, first to ascertain his facts, his logic is as irresistible as his laugh.

V.

All life seems, when he began to find it out, to have the look of a vast joke, whether the joke was on him or on his fellow beings, or if it may be expressed without any irreverence, on their common creator. But it was never wholly a joke, and it was not long before his literature began to own its pathos. The sense of this is not very apparent in "Innocents Abroad," but in "Roughing It" we began to be distinctly aware of it, and in the successive books it is constantly imminent, not as a clutch at the heart-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

strings, but as a demand of common justice, common sense, the feeling of proportion. It is not sympathy with the under dog merely as under dog that moves Mark Twain; for the under dog is sometimes rightfully under. But the probability is that it is wrongfully under, and has a claim to your inquiry into the case which you cannot ignore without atrocity. Mark Twain never ignores it; I know nothing finer in him than his perception that in this curiously contrived mechanism men suffer for their sorrows rather oftener than they suffer for their sins; and when they suffer for their sorrows they have a right not only to our pity but to our help. He always gives his help, even when he seems to leave the pity to others, and it may be safely said that no writer has dealt with so many phases of life with more unfailing justice. There is no real telling how any one comes to be what he is; all speculation concerning the fact is more or less impudent or futile conjecture; but it is conceivable that Mark Twain took from his early environment the custom of clairvoyance in things in which most humorists are purblind, and that being always in the presence of the under dog, he came to feel for him as under with him. If the knowledge and vision of slavery did not tinge all life with potential tragedy, perhaps it was this which lighted in the future humorist the indignation at injustice which glows in his page. His indignation relieves itself as often as not in a laugh; injustice is the most ridiculous thing in the world, after all, and indignation with it feels its own absurdity.

It is supposable, if not more than supposable, that the ludicrous incongruity of a slaveholding democracy nurtured upon the Declaration of Independence, and the comical spectacle of white labor owning black labor, had something to do in quickening the sense of contrast which is the mountain of humor, or is said to be so. But not to drive too hard a conjecture which must remain conjecture, we may reasonably hope to find in the untrammelled, the almost unconditional life of the later and farther West, with its individualism limited by nothing but individualism, the outside causes of the first overflow of the spring. We are so fond of classification, which we think is somehow interpretation, that one cannot resist the temptation it holds out in the case of the most unclassifiable things; and I must yield so far as to note that the earliest form of Mark Twain's work is characteristic of the greater part of it. The method used in "Innocents Abroad"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and in "Roughing It" is the method used in "Life on the Mississippi," in "A Tramp Abroad" and in "Following the Equator," which constitute in bulk a good half of all his writings, as they express his dominant æsthetics. If he had written the fictions alone, we should have had to recognize a rare inventive talent, a great imagination and dramatic force; but I think it must be allowed that the personal books named overshadow the fictions. They have the qualities that give character to the fictions, and they have advantages that the fictions have not and that no fiction can have. In them, under cover of his pseudonym, we come directly into the presence of the author, which is what the reader is always longing and seeking to do; but unless the novelist is a conscienceless and tasteless recreant to the terms of his art, he cannot admit the reader to his intimacy. The personal books of Mark Twain have not only the charm of the essay's inconsequent and desultory method, in which invention, fact, reflection and philosophy wander in after one another in any following that happens, but they are of an immediate and most informal hospitality which admits you at once to the author's confidence, and makes you frankly welcome not only to his thought but to his way of thinking. He takes no trouble in the matter, and he asks you to take none. All that he requires is that you will have common sense, and be able to tell a joke when you see it. Otherwise the whole furnishing of his mental mansion is at your service, to make such use as you can of it, but he will not be always directing your course, or requiring you to enjoy yourself in this or that order.

In the case of the fictions, he conceives that his first affair is to tell a story, and a story when you are once launched upon it does not admit of deviation without some hurt to itself. In Mark Twain's novels, whether they are for boys or for men, the episodes are only those that illustrate the main narrative or relate to it, though he might have allowed himself somewhat larger latitude in the old-fashioned tradition which he has oftenest observed in them. When it comes to the critical writings, which again are personal, and which, whether they are criticisms of literature or of life, are always so striking, he is quite relentlessly logical and coherent. Here there is no lounging or sauntering, with entertaining or edifying digressions. The object is in view from the first, and the reasoning is straightforwardly to it throughout. This is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as notable in the admirable paper on the Jews, or on the Austrian situation, as in that on Harriet Shelley, or that on Cooper's novels. The facts are first ascertained with a conscience uncommon in critical writing of any kind, and then they are handled with vigor and precision till the polemic is over. It does not so much matter whether you agree with the critic or not; what you have to own is that here is a man of strong convictions, clear ideas and ardent sentiments, based mainly upon common sense of extraordinary depth and breadth.

VI.

In fact, what finally appeals to you in Mark Twain, and what may hereafter be his peril with his readers, is his common sense. It is well to eat humble pie when one comes to it at the *table d'hôte* of life, and I wish here to offer my brother literary men a piece of it that I never refuse myself. It is true that other men do not really expect much common sense of us, whether we are poets or novelists or humorists. They may enjoy our company, and they may like us or pity us, but they do not take us very seriously, and they would as soon we were fools as not if we will only divert or comfort or inspire them. Especially if we are humorists do they doubt our practical wisdom; they are apt at first sight to take our sense for a part of the joke, and the humorist who convinces them that he is a man of as much sense as any of them, and possibly more, is in the parlous case of having given them hostages for seriousness which he may not finally be able to redeem.

I should say in the haste to which every inquiry of this sort seems subject, that this was precisely the case with Mark Twain. The exceptional observer must have known from the beginning that he was a thinker of courageous originality and penetrating sagacity, even when he seemed to be joking; but in the process of time it has come to such a pass with him that the wayfaring man can hardly shirk knowledge of the fact. The fact is thrown into sudden and picturesque relief by his return to his country after the lapse of time long enough to have let a new generation grow up in knowledge of him. The projection of his reputation against a background of foreign appreciation, more or less luminous, such as no other American author has enjoyed, has little or nothing to do with his acceptance on the new terms. Those

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

poor Germans, Austrians, Englishmen and Frenchmen who have been, from time to time in the last ten years, trying to show their esteem for his peculiar gifts could never come as close to the heart of his humor as we could; we might well doubt if they could fathom all his wisdom, which begins and ends in his humor; and if ever they seemed to chance upon his full significance, we naturally felt a kind of grudge, when we could not call it their luck, and suspected him of being less significant in the given instances than they supposed. The danger which he now runs with us is neither heightened nor lessened by the spread of his fame, but is an effect from intrinsic causes. Possibly it might not have been so great if he had come back comparatively forgotten; it is certain only that in coming back more remembered than ever, he confronts a generation which began to know him not merely by his personal books and his fiction, but by those criticisms of life and literature which have more recently attested his interest in the graver and weightier things.

Graver and weightier, people call them, but whether they are really more important than the lighter things, I am by no means sure. What I am amused with, independently of the final truth, is the possibility that his newer audience will exact this serious mood of Mr. Clemens, whereas we of his older world only suffered it, and were of a high conceit with our liberality in allowing a humorist sometimes to be a philosopher. Some of us indeed, not to be invidiously specific as to whom, were always aware of potentialities in him, which he seemed to hold in check, or to trust doubtfully to his reader as if he thought they might be thought part of the joke. Looking back over his work now, the later reader would probably be able to point out to earlier readers the evidence of a constant growth in the direction of something like recognized authority in matters of public import, especially those that were subject to the action of the public conscience as well as the public interest, until now hardly any man writing upon such matters is heard so willingly by all sorts of men. All of us, for instance, have read somewhat of the conditions in South Africa which have eventuated in the present effort of certain British politicians to destroy two free Republics in the interest of certain British speculators; but I doubt if we have found the case anywhere so well stated as in the closing chapters of Mark Twain's "Following the Equator." His esti-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mate of the military character of the belligerents on either side is of the prophetic cast which can come only from the thorough assimilation of accomplished facts; and in those passages the student of the actual war can spell its anticipative history. It is by such handling of such questions, unpremeditated and almost casual as it seems, that Mark Twain has won his claim to be heard on any public matter, and achieved the odd sort of primacy which he now enjoys.

But it would be rather awful if the general recognition of his prophetic function should implicate the renunciation of the humor that has endeared him to mankind. It would be well for his younger following to beware of reversing the error of the elder, and taking everything in earnest, as these once took nothing in earnest from him. To reverse that error would not be always to find his true meaning, and perhaps we shall best arrive at this by shunning each other's mistakes. In the light of the more modern appreciation, we elders may be able to see some things seriously that we once thought pure drolling, and from our experience his younger admirers may learn to receive as drolling some things that they might otherwise accept as preaching. What we all should wish to do is to keep Mark Twain what he has always been: a comic force unique in the power of charming us out of our cares and troubles, united with as potent an ethic sense of the duties, public and private, which no man denies in himself without being false to other men. I think we may hope for the best he can do to help us deserve our self-respect, without forming Mark Twain societies to read philanthropic meanings into his jokes, or studying the Jumping Frog as the allegory of an imperializing Republic. I trust the time may be far distant when the Meditation at the Tomb of Adam shall be memorized and declaimed by ingenuous youth as a mystical appeal for human solidarity.

W. D. HOWELLS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VICTORIA AND HER REIGN.

BY LADY JEUNE.

It was in the early morning dawn of January the 20th, 1837, that the Archbishop of Canterbury and Lord Conyngham, the Lord Chamberlain, left Windsor for Kensington to convey the news to Princess Victoria that King William the Fourth had passed away, and that she was the Queen of Great Britain and Ireland. The King's death had been expected for some weeks, and the Princess was therefore not unprepared for the news.

The Princess was the only child of Edward, Duke of Kent, fourth son of George the Third, and her mother was the daughter of the Duke of Saxe-Coburg Saalfeld. The Duchess of Kent had formerly been married to the Prince of Leiningen, which had been an unhappy union; and her second marriage, though a happy one, was of short duration, for the Duke died two years after its celebration from the effects of a sudden chill.

Most simple and unostentatious were the life and upbringing of the young Princess. She and her mother lived in Kensington Palace; and for many years the Duchess of Kent was in straitened circumstances, owing to the debts which her husband had contracted and which she endeavored to pay, but which were not finally cleared off until the accession of his daughter.

Kensington Palace, where the Princess spent her childhood, was one of the largest and most imposing of all the royal residences in England; but it was not a very cheerful house, and the early life of the little girl was perhaps a sad time, as her rank placed her in a position of isolation, and she was unable to enjoy the society of young people of her own age. Great attention was paid to the development of her physical and mental qualities. She was made to ride and walk and take plenty of outdoor exercise, and there are some alive now who remember the little carriage

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in which she rode, and later the sunny, bright-haired child who careered by her mother's side, playing with her dogs, in the shady walks of Kensington Gardens.

The early education of the Princess was undertaken by the Duchess of Kent, who supervised her governesses and teachers with great care. She received her religious training largely at the hands of Dr. Davis, afterward Bishop of Peterborough; but, undoubtedly, the person who exercised most influence over the Princess in her early years was her governess, Baroness Lehnzen, who retained her influence in a great measure as long as she lived. For many years, the Princess was kept by her mother in complete ignorance of her future; and the story of how it first dawned on her is quite true and so touching that it bears constant repetition. The King's age and bad health made it necessary to provide for a Regency, and a bill for the purpose was laid before Parliament. Baroness Lehnzen thought the Princess should be told and received the Duchess of Kent's permission to tell her. The genealogical paper of the family was put into the Princess's History Book, and when the Princess's lesson was over she observed the paper, and said: "I never saw that before." "It was not thought necessary that you should, Princess," was the reply. "Then I am nearer the Throne than I thought." "It is so, madam." The child was very quiet for some moments, and then said: "How many a child would boast, but they do not know the difficulty; there is much splendor but much responsibility;" and, putting her little hand into that of the governess, she said: "I will be good, dear Lehnzen; I will be good."

The girl's earnestness of purpose, and the settled determination of her mind that she would make herself worthy of the high position to which she would some day be called, were the keynote of the whole of the life of Queen Victoria, and in every way she endeavored to subordinate her life to the welfare of the great empire over which she reigned. She was fortunate enough, at the most critical moment of her life, to be able to command the services of Lord Melbourne, who, while being a wise counsellor, was a most devoted friend, whose affection and care for her knew no bounds, and who, in the years when her inexperience and youthful impulsiveness might have created great difficulties, steered the ship of state with the utmost wisdom and discretion. To him the Queen gave her unbounded confidence, and on him

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

she leaned with perfect safety. He was never absent from her side, and in the smallest details of every-day life she consulted him, even so far as asking him to read books so as to tell her whether they were desirable or instructive.

To a girl brought up as the Queen had been, in a quiet and unostentatious way, the change to a position of great dignity and magnificence must have been almost insupportable; yet she conducted herself as if she had been born on the throne. Nothing more surprised all those with whom she came into contact than the calm dignity of her manner, and the remarkable ease with which she at once took up the duties of her exalted position. She sent for all the great officials connected with the preparations for the Proclamation and supervised the programme of her Coronation, attended to state business with the strictest regularity and amazed every one by the capacity she showed for the work of which she had had no experience hitherto. Her day was mapped out on a plan which was followed with the greatest faithfulness, and her pleasures and relaxations were never allowed to interfere with the dispatch of state business. The exalted rank of her daughter necessarily put the Duchess of Kent into a somewhat subordinate position; and the Queen, from all accounts, allowed little if any interference from her mother in state matters. Up to the time of her accession, she had always slept in a little bed in her mother's room, but when she became Queen she ordered her bed to be removed into a room which she occupied alone. This self-assertion showed every one that no ordinary woman would be developed from the young Queen. She had a strong opinion on every point, great self-reliance and determination. She showed, at the same time, the utmost consideration for the feelings of others. One or two incidents in her relations with the Queen Dowager are very touching, especially the readiness with which she agreed to the Queen Dowager's request that her personal attendants might be provided for, and her instructions to Lord Melbourne, on the occasion of her first visit to Windsor to see the Queen Dowager, to give orders that the flag which flew at half-mast should not be raised upon her arrival.

The first public appearance of the Queen was at St. James's Palace, when the Proclamation was read, and she appeared at one of the windows with her mother and the great officers of state, where her appearance called forth the greatest acclamation and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enthusiasm. At that early age of eighteen, she was a pretty English girl; she had a very fresh complexion, a quantity of fair hair, bright blue eyes, though her face was not perfect, and she was short of stature and inclined to be plump. Whatever defects she had were, however, forgotten in the great air of dignity which she possessed and, above all, in the charm of her voice and smile, which once seen and heard were never forgotten.

The next ceremonial in which the Queen took part was the prorogation of Parliament. Not having been crowned, she wore only a magnificent tiara of diamonds, and her stomacher and dress were blazing with brilliants. She was dressed in white satin; and, after ascending the throne, the purple robes were fastened on her shoulders by her lords-in-waiting. Later in the year, she paid her first visit to the City and dined at the Guildhall. On passing Temple Bar, which was then the City Boundary, the keys of the City were given to her; and it was a curious coincidence that on that occasion she knighted the first Jewish Sheriff, the late Sir Moses Montefiore, who, to the last day of his life, described with rapturous admiration the graceful and gracious way in which, her face wreathed in smiles, the Queen rose and bowed her acknowledgment to her health, the toast of the evening.

It is not necessary to dwell on the incidents of the Coronation. One can well imagine the fatigue and solemnity of the day to the young girl. The day was fine, fortunately for the myriads of people who flocked the streets, anxious to catch a glimpse of the gorgeous procession and, perchance, of the principal figure in it. Inside the sacred fane of England were gathered all that was great and glorious in the land, and the brilliancy of the scene baffles description. The Peers and Peeresses of England, all attired in their robes, formed a gorgeous background, with ambassadors and great officers of state in brilliant uniforms, among whom Prince Esterhazy is said to have been the most conspicuous on account of the diamonds he wore. The Queen drove from Buckingham Palace in the state coach, attended by the Duchess of Sutherland, Mistress of the Robes; and, to those who saw her, the slight, pale, agitated girl, dressed in simple white, was a more touching figure than that of the Queen in her crown and royal robes after the Coronation, as she returned bowing her acknowledgments on her way to the Palace.

The strength of character shown by the Queen in the early

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

days of her reign, no doubt fostered by Lord Melbourne's wise companionship, grew as her experience and knowledge of affairs increased, and she gave many proofs of her power of will and determination, even in political matters. The first indication of her strength of purpose regarding a political matter was given in connection with the celebrated question of the Bedchamber difficulty, when, Lord Melbourne's Government having been defeated on the Jamaica Bill, he resigned and Sir Robert Peel took office. Sir Robert Peel and the Tories had long viewed the supremacy of Lord Melbourne with jealousy, as well as the whole of the Queen's Whig entourage. Sir Robert told the Queen that she must regard her ladies-in-waiting in the same light as lords-in-waiting, who change with each Government. The Queen's indignation and anger knew no bounds, nor could the Duke of Wellington influence her in the smallest degree. In the end Sir Robert Peel had to give way, and the Queen retained her Whig Prime Minister and her ladies. It is said that the Queen exclaimed to Lord Melbourne, on describing the encounter with Sir Robert Peel: "Do not fear that I was not calm and composed. They wanted to deprive me of my ladies, and I suppose they would deprive me of most of my dresses and my housemaids. They wish to treat me like a girl, but I will show them that I am Queen of England." The probability was that the Queen feared, if she gave way on this one point, that an attempt might be made to deprive her of Baroness Lehnzen, her old governess, to whom she was deeply attached; while Peel, on his part, dreaded the difficulties which a Tory minister might encounter at the hands of a high spirited girl of nineteen entirely surrounded by women opposed to him in politics.

The Queen's marriage to Prince Albert of Saxe Gotha was for long the dream of her uncle, King Leopold of Belgium, and of the faithful Baron Holzman, the Prince's tutor and devoted friend. The cousins had met during some of the Princess's visits abroad, and the Prince paid a visit to England with his brother, in 1836, as a guest of his aunt, the Duchess of Kent. It was then that King Leopold decided that Albert would be a fitting husband for the future Queen; and, though he was not sure of the young man's feelings, he very soon discovered that the Princess shared his own. The position was a very difficult and delicate one for both the young people, for the time which elapsed before the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

matter was settled was full of rumors of the engagement. It was at first thought that it would be better that the marriage should not take place for four years after the accession of the Queen; but the visit of the two brothers in the autumn of 1839 put an end to all such intentions, for the Queen found that she could not let Prince Albert leave England except as her affianced husband. It was a trying situation for the young girl (whose rank made it imperative that the initiative should come from her) to be placed in, but it was arranged that the giving the Prince a certain flower was to be taken as an indication that he might declare his love. Many years afterwards, a very amusing story was told of the Queen's having said to some one who, in course of conversation on a like subject, alluded to the difficulty of the woman's position: "Oh! that was nothing in comparison to what I had to undergo; for I had to propose to Albert." The little episode was settled in the Queen's sitting room on the evening of the 15th of October, 1839; and her own words are truly touching, which she writes to her uncle Leopold: "These last few days have passed like a dream to me. I am so bewildered by it all that I hardly know how to write; but I do feel very happy." The union thus arranged proved happy in the highest and best sense of the word. To say that they were united is but a faint way of expressing the sympathy, trust and affection that existed between them.

The Queen wished to wait for the opening of Parliament to make the public and formal announcement of her engagement to Prince Albert; but it was thought desirable to call a meeting of the Privy Council, at which, with Prince Albert's bracelet on her arm, which, she said, "seemed to give her courage," she made the eventful statement. The marriage ceremony at St. James's Palace was solemnized in the morning, and the crowds which thronged the streets were greater than those which had witnessed the visit of the allied sovereigns in 1814. The Queen drove with the Duchess of Kent and the Duchess of Sutherland, her first mistress of the Robes and her life-long friend, to the Chapel. She was attended by twelve bridesmaids, and on arriving at the Palace she was conducted to the Royal Closet, where she was robed by her maids of honor, and, preceded by the great officers of state, she entered the Chapel. Her uncle, the Duke of Sussex, gave her away, and the newly married couple proceeded hand in hand to the Throne Room to sign the register, and returned to Buck-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ingham Palace. An old custom was revived on the occasion of the marriage, by the giving of presentation wedding rings to a few favored friends and distinguished people; these were composed of tiny gold profile portraits of the young couple, set in a true lover's knot.

The years that passed from that time till the Prince's death in 1861 were full of stirring incidents and much political strife. The Crimean war, the Indian mutiny, the Chinese and Afghan wars and the Canadian rebellion took place, and there were the constantly recurring disagreements with the United States. At home, there was a great discontent, a great deal of poverty among the working classes caused by the depression of trade, and much public disquiet. But whatever political troubles and anxieties existed during these years, they were more than compensated for by the happiness of the Queen's home life and her increasing domestic interests. The birth of her children, all strong and healthy; the opening of the great exhibition of 1857, which seemed to mark a new era in national prosperity; the friendship of the Emperor Napoleon, which destroyed so much of the bitterness, the inevitable heritage of long wars, between England and France; and the victories of her armies in the Crimea and in India—all helped to fill the cup of her prosperity.

The first break in the happy family circle took place when Prince Frederick William of Prussia wedded the Princess Royal. There is a great deal to be read about their courtship and marriage from the Queen's own pen. Very soon afterward, another break was to be made by the engagement of Princess Alice to the Crown-Prince Louis of Hesse. These partings, though they made a blank in the home circle, were so satisfactory in their circumstances, and the prospects of the future happiness of her daughters so well assured, that the Queen and mother could only rejoice; and, under the shadow of the dark cloud which was so soon to wreck her own happy life, she prepared herself to say farewell to her dear ones. The Prince Consort, whose constitution even as a young man had never been robust, had, with increasing years, become a stronger man, and was able to take an active part in every sport and occupation enjoyed by Englishmen. No illness had ever caused the Queen any anxiety until the typhoid fever which proved fatal developed itself. The fever, which was not of a severe kind, ran its normal course; but there was not vitality

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enough left to enable him to throw off the effects, and suddenly the nation, which was watching the reports from the sick room with deep and anxious attention, was shocked and stunned at the intelligence that the Prince Consort was dying. The death of the Duchess of Kent early in the year had been the first bereavement that the Queen had experienced in her life; but, much as she sorrowed for her mother, it had been expected that that parting must soon come in the course of nature. The Prince had passed a somewhat busy autumn and he was overtired; and, as extracts from his journal tell us, he had for a long time been feeling very ill, and his nervous system was exhausted. The Queen, with the hopefulness of her nature, did not realize how ill he was, nor till the 11th of November did the doctors tell her of his serious condition, and on the 14th the end came. No words can ever describe the overwhelming sorrow of that bereavement, or the grief which hallowed that deathbed.

The country awoke to its sense of bereavement with a feeling of remorse, for the Prince during his life had never been appreciated as he deserved. His complete self-abnegation, his unselfishness and the way in which he merged his life in that of the Queen, living only for her and appearing only through her, had given an impression that the work he did and his influence were comparatively small; and it was only when he died that the country realized how, with every temptation to lead a life of pleasure, he had lived one of unceasing devotion to duty and of unstinted labor for the welfare of others. A most touching story was told by one of the Queen's ladies of how deeply the Queen deplored that the untimely death of the Prince had deprived her and the country of the opportunity of understanding during his life how much they owed to his great and noble unselfishness. With tears streaming down her cheeks, she said: "Oh! if I could only call my people together and say to them before him: 'Here is the fountainhead of every good desire, every noble aspiration I have ever had. Here is the guiding hand and heart that has lived only for me and my people, and when I hear you say I am good or wise or a great Queen, I long to tell you that what I am he has made me, and that without him I should have been unworthy in every way.'" But it was all too late, the true heart was still, the busy brain at rest, and all he had loved and worked for left alone to weep for him. How truly she felt her desolation, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Queen well described when she said: "There is no one left now to call me by my Christian name."

The marriage of Princess Alice was postponed, and her time was entirely given up to her mother. She had nursed her father during his long illness, and after his death she stood almost alone with her mother in those dark hours, seeing Ministers and having all official communications to the Queen made through her. When the marriage took place it was solemnized quietly in the drawing-room at Osborne, all members of the Royal Family being present. The Queen was present at the marriage of the Prince of Wales in St. George's Chapel, witnessing it from the royal pew. In 1866, when she opened Parliament in person, the procession from the Palace to Westminster was watched by dense crowds, and the House of Lords was thronged by Peers eager to see the Queen again take part in that brilliant pageant; but nothing could be sadder or more touching than the sight of the widowed Queen, wearing the cap of mourning, as she walked slowly to the throne covered by the purple robes she could not be induced to wear. She looked neither to the right nor left, but sitting down she remained motionless, with eyes fixed on the ground, and listened to the reading of the royal speech by the Lord Chancellor. When it was finished, she slowly rose, kissed the Prince of Wales, who led her by the hand to the great door, through which, with a flourish of trumpets, she disappeared.

After that period, the Queen more frequently appeared in public, though not often enough to please some of her subjects, whose unfeeling criticisms provoked the indignation of some of the most radical of her people, and by none was she more warmly defended than by Mr. John Bright. In justification of her retirement, the Queen wrote a most touching letter to the people which appeared in *The Times,* appealing to their sympathy and assuring them that, while the material interests of the country would never suffer from any neglect of duty on her part, it was impossible for her to recover from her ever abiding desolation which had taken the place of her former happiness. No one looking back on her long reign can honestly say that the Queen has ever shirked or evaded any work that she was told was good for the interests of her subjects; and that all she did was appreciated, the enthusiasm her appearances in public have called forth sufficiently guarantee.

During the last years of her reign, the Queen became im-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mensely popular, her personal qualities having greatly endeared her to the people. In her reign and by her life, she set the loftiest standard of morality and showed her keen sense of responsibility. Though not often seen in public, her people knew that their welfare was her highest and deepest interest, and that she labored for it unceasingly. The isolation of her position, with all its grandeur, appealed to their finest sense of chivalry, and the domestic virtues of the Queen and her family represented all that was best and most sacred in English life. The virtues which she so nobly illustrated are repeated in the lives of her children, and their devotion and that of her grandchildren have always been among the most significant proofs of her goodness.

To no other sovereign have the united acclamation and voice of the people ever spoken as they did to her in the jubilee years. None who witnessed the streets of London, the processions and all the attendant splendors of those wonderful and never-to-be-forgotten days could doubt that the love of her people for Queen Victoria was of the deepest and truest nature. No one who saw the wondrous procession of Princes, all related by blood or marriage to the little old lady in the carriage, with her gracious smile and her eyes brimful of tears, could ever forget the scene. Men, women and children came from all corners of the Empire, and from among all the races that owned her sway, to raise their voices in the chorus of congratulation and gratitude to her, to whose beneficent reign they owed so much of their prosperity. Those who witnessed the home side of the picture, tell of the joyous and affectionate embraces and caresses which were lavished on her by her children on her return home from these bewildering demonstrations of loyalty.

The Queen's life was up to the last a very busy one, almost too busy for her age and strength, and she occupied herself with state affairs and work for her country without sparing herself. To the end she led an almost monotonous daily life. She rose and breakfasted early, and gave all her morning to the transaction of state work. In the summer, when the weather permitted it, she breakfasted at Frogmore in the garden there. After luncheon she drove, and returning late did what work had arrived during the day, dining at 9 o'clock, a meal which she accomplished with extraordinary rapidity, never being more than half an hour at table. The household complained of the shortness of the time

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

allowed for the meal on account of the rapidity with which the Queen ate. The Queen rose first from the table, followed by the members of her family into the corridor, where coffee was served. In the days when she was able to move about, she walked from one guest to another, saying a few words to each; in late years, when she was obliged to sit, they were sent for in turn to speak to her. After remaining for about an hour, the Queen would retire to her private apartments, where she would either write or be read to by one of her ladies, and she rarely went to bed before midnight. There is no doubt that the Queen inherited the strength and vitality of her race to an extraordinary degree, for she never had an illness in her life, and her power of endurance was marvellous. The etiquette which prevented any one from sitting down in her presence was often a great load on her daughters and her ladies, and she often kindly sent her pages to some of her guests, who were suffering discomfort in following that rule, to say that she hoped they would go into the next room and rest; but she seemed never to feel the necessity for rest herself. After she had the fall downstairs which partially crippled her in later life, she found sitting down or being wheeled in a chair very irksome; and the increase of her blindness toward the end of her life was a very great trial to her, which she bore, however, with great cheerfulness.

The Queen had the greatest belief in and affection for those she liked, and was the warmest champion and friend. To those around her immediate person she was affectionate, and most kind and considerate to her servants. She was fond of those who amused her, and she listened to social news most intently. She was of a deeply sympathetic nature, the joys and sorrows of life appealing to her strongly. She was a most devoted mother, but not perhaps a tender one, for her children, loving her as they did, were always in awe of her and only her grandchildren were ever able quite to speak their minds in her presence. The Prince Consort and she paid every attention to the education of their family, selecting their teachers with the greatest care, the principal responsibility falling on the Prince, as the Queen's time was too much occupied with state affairs to allow her to devote much of it to her family; but she always saw her children morning and evening when they were small, and as soon as they were old enough they took their meals with her. Few lives could be more

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

simple and unpretentious than theirs, and they were brought up without any extravagance in dress or surroundings, the result of which is that her daughters have made excellent wives for poor men. The relations between the Queen and the Prince of Wales have always been of the most intimate and tender character, and, for the first time for many reigns, we have seen a sovereign and the Heir Apparent on the most affectionate terms. Nothing could be more touching than the Prince's respectful and devoted manner to the Queen in public, or the sweet, frank smile which always brightened up her otherwise sad face when she turned to welcome or to thank him.

The Queen was always a most vehement opponent of every movement that had for its ultimate object the higher education and development of women. She disliked the idea of women's education being placed on the same basis as that of men. With women like Mrs. Fawcett or Mrs. Garrett Anderson she had no sympathy, and the idea of female suffrage was abhorrent to her. She had the strongest prejudices against public men with whom she differed in politics; and though she was far too constitutional a Queen ever to allow her feelings to interfere with public business, she had her likes and dislikes strongly defined. Her favorite Prime Ministers were Lord Melbourne, Lord Beaconsfield, and Lord Salisbury. She never was on easy terms with Mr. Gladstone or any of the Liberal Party, except, perhaps, Lord Rosebery at the beginning of his administration. As to Mr. Chamberlain, she had long a great fear that he would prove a dangerous factor in English politics; but, when the question of the union broke up the Liberal Party, she showed in the most unmistakable manner her approbation of the Liberal Unionist leaders. On the occasion of the opening of the Imperial Institute, it was remarked by every one that she placed strong emphasis on the words, "the union of my Empire." It was always said that Lord Beaconsfield, who was a thorough courtier, gained his influence over her by giving way to her opinions on nearly every point, or, at any rate, by persuading her that he did so. There is a little story to the effect that, in discussing literary matters with her, he used to speak of "we authors." Her affection for him, at any rate, was very deep and sincere, and she mourned for him not only on national but personal grounds.

In general society for the last few years the Queen had but

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

few friends, and her hospitality generally consisted of a few dinners when at Windsor to the members of the Government and the Opposition and one or two leading people in society. During the long years after the Prince Consort's death, she gave up every kind of evening amusement, such as the theatre or opera, but lately she had representations from time to time of the popular plays and operas. St. George's Hall at Windsor was for the time transformed into a theatre, and the Queen attended, always enjoying herself very much; but, as she never led the applause, and no one dared to give the signal, the effect on the actors and audience was most depressing. She always received the *corps dramatique* after the performance, charming them by her winning smile and gracious approval, as well as by the little mementoes she presented them with. After the marriage of Princess Beatrice, the Queen was surrounded by younger people; and the younger members of the Royal Family being very fond of acting, and there being one or two good performers among the court attendants, theatricals and tableaux in which every one took part were a constant source of amusement to her.

It was pathetic to see, as her weakness and blindness increased, the resignation and cheerfulness with which she bore her troubles. She had always a strong dislike to being waited on and liked doing things for herself, and her growing dependence was a great trial to her. Her children and grandchildren were ever ready to do all they could to solace and comfort her, and her motherly gratitude and affection deepened as her life advanced.

With all the splendors of the Court of England, the Queen had little or no sympathy. She loved the quiet, simple life of an Englishwoman more than all the grandeur of one of the greatest and richest courts of Europe. Her own personal wants were very small, and her tastes very simple. She never dressed extravagantly nor lived luxuriously, and she died a poor woman. The Civil List of the Queen was £385,000 a year, out of which the salaries of all the court officials and one or two outside offices were paid, the Queen paying, besides, for all her own entourage; the offices of Lord Chamberlain, Lord Steward and Master of the Horse being defrayed by the Government. The income which was granted by the country to the Queen sounds large and more than ample; and yet, measured by what is expected of the sovereign, is not so. The price paid by the Queen for every article is larger

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than that paid by her subjects, and the number of presents which she is expected to give is enormous. The Queen did not die a rich woman, though it was always the custom to talk of her vast fortune. She started in life having to pay her father's debts, which were very heavy; and though she has had small legacies left her they are comparatively insignificant. She gave each of her daughters £100,000 when married, besides providing for the young Duke of Albany and helping her other children in many ways. She purchased Balmoral, Osborne and Claremont out of her savings, so that the residue of her property was small. She gave always generously to charities, and in many ways which no one ever heard of. She was more interested in some charities than others, the sorrows of widows and children, and of those who were bereaved, appealing strongly to her widowed heart. The cause of education when allied to religion interested her; the new development of women's lives only interested her up to a certain point, and she was very chary of giving her support and help to rescue-work among the fallen. Some of the most touching scenes in her life are those connected with visits to hospitals, either in London, the provinces or at her Soldiers' hospital at Netley. There was one public occasion on which she showed her sympathy with the realization of a great scheme, which had for its aim the amelioration of the condition of the poor in the East End of London, when in state she went to open the "People's Palace." The part she went to was, perhaps, the poorest and most squalid of all the East of London, yet the decorations and the joy of the people at welcoming her among them were more varied and more enthusiastic than those of her richer subjects in the West End.

The Queen was a warm-hearted, generous woman, with strong likes and dislikes and a very quick temper, which made her passionate and hasty at times. She took some time to forget an injury or an insult. There is one very touching story told of her and the Prince Consort, which is so generally believed to be true that it may be repeated now without indiscretion. On one occasion when there had been some difference between them and the Queen had expressed herself with some heat, the Prince, as was his custom on such occasions, withdrew to his room and locked the door. Presently, a knock came to his door, and on asking who was there he was told, "The Queen." He answered that he was engaged, and a second knock came, followed by the same question

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the same reply. After a lapse of a few minutes a gentle knock was heard, and on the Prince's inquiring who was there, the Queen answered, "Your wife"; whereupon the door was opened, with the loving assurance that what the Queen demanded might not be possible, but the wife's appeal was unanswerable.

The Queen, as is known, had a great affection for Scotland and her Scotch home. There she enjoyed the perfect freedom she longed for; she lived among a simple people, into whose lives she entered, and whose joys and sorrows she was allowed to share; and the upbuilding of Balmoral as her home was one of her most cherished occupations. She visited the sick and dying, sat at the bedsides of her own people, read to those who needed it, and in the fresh, light air of the Highlands found only pleasure and repose.

The Queen was a great woman in the sense that her age, her vast experience and her knowledge of the world made her quite a unique personage. She had known all the great men of her day, and she had lived to see greater and vaster changes, both politically and socially, than any other sovereign. She saw the practical development of steam and the wonderful changes it has wrought, she saw the great economic laws of the country changed, she lived through what in other countries would have wrought revolutions, she has seen institutions on which the stability of her Empire was supposed to depend swept away, and the Government of the country transferred from the aristocracy to the toiling multitude of working men; but she also lived to see the stability of her throne stronger and more firmly established through her own constitutional conduct of affairs. Last of all, she lived to see the largest Empire the world has ever known welded together under her sceptre by unbreakable bonds, and in a federation of which her name was the watchword.

The Victorian Era has been one of the most glorious in the history of England, and to no one does it owe its brilliancy more than to Queen Victoria. Had she been more intellectual, she would have lacked that homely common sense and that sympathy with the sorrows and joys of her people which distinguished her. Under the royal purple and the diamond crown, her people discovered the heart not of the Queen, but of the woman who understood and entered into the smaller interests and occupations of life which form the strongest bond of human sympathy.

M. JEUNE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED